NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXXXVIII.

MARCH, 1889.

OLD TIMES IN CALIFORNIA.

BY GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN.

THE rise and development of California and of the Pacific States and Territories seem to have more interest to the present generation than the slower, steadier growth of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Dakota, Colorado, etc. The Southeastern States of our Union, though making large progress, have seemingly withdrawn from competition with the Great West.

There are plenty of histories of California, and all I now propose is to supply from my own memory some episodes illustrating the American method for a State or group of States to pass from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. In 1846 there were two distinct Californias—Upper and Lower. The name of California is generally supposed to come from the two Latin words, calor (heat), fornax (oven). This name might properly apply to Lower, but not to Upper California. Upper California has a temperate climate, and was first colonized by pious people from Mexico, who solely aimed to christianize the native Indians. When our ancestors were fighting the French in Canada (1756), and afterwards fighting for the Independence of the Colonies from the Dominion of Great Britain (1775-83), these pious people were employed in founding the missions of San Diego, San Luis Rey, St. Juan Capistrano, San Gabriel, Maria de los Angeles,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

San Fernando, Buenaventura, Santa Barbara, Santa Inez, San Luis Obispo, San Miguel, Soledad, Monterey, San Juan Bautista, Santa Clara, San Francisco de Asiz, San Rafael and Sonoma. The Indians of the Pacific Coast were a most submissive race, were taught agriculture and some of the ruder arts, and the period from 1756 to 1830 is, or was, described as a sort of Elysium.

In 1821 the Republic of Mexico fought for and gained her independence from Spain, thereby becoming sovereign of both the Californias. The missions named were soon after "secularized"—that is, were reduced to civil instead of religious rule. The authority of the priests thereby became limited to their churches, schools, gardens, orchards, etc., and Mexico granted their other or surplus lands and privileges to outsiders and immigrants. Old soldiers were thus compensated for services to Mexico, and as a rule these new settlers, or rancheros, devoted their time to the rearing of horses, cattle, and sheep. There never was or can be a better description of California in that epoch (1830–5) than is contained in Dana's "Two Years Before the Mast," accessible to every reader.

In 1846 the United States declared war to exist with Mexico, and I, as a Lieutenant of Captain C. Q. Tompkins's company of the Third Artillery, was sent in the U. S. store-ship "Lexington" to California, around Cape Horn, 198 days buffeting with the winds and waves, yet arriving, January 29, 1847, at Monterey, the most speedy and convenient route possible at that day. There was no city of San Francisco then. Our orders were to occupy and hold Monterey, the capital of Alta, or Upper, California. We found there a lieutenant of U. S. Marines (Maddox), and a midshipman (Baldwin), who transferred the public property to us most gracefully, and our Company F, Third Artillery, Captain C. Q. Tompkins, became masters of the situation.

The frigate "Independence" lay in the harbor, commanded by Commodore William Bransford Shubrick, a native of South Carolina, one of the most accomplished gentlemen I have ever met. I happened to be on board of that frigate dining with the ward-room officers when the sloop of war "Cyane," Captain Du Pont, was reported off the harbor coming in from San Diego. In that sloop was General S. W. Kearney, of the regular army of the United States, who, with a small escort, had come across the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinent with orders to command the land forces, leaving the navy equal control at sea.

Thus wisely and properly the division of power was adjusted, order and system resulted, and from that day to this Upper California has grown by the natural law of American development, whilst Lower California yet remains *in statu quo*, a province of Mexico.

In 1847, only forty-two years ago, there was no such thing as a mail in California. Letters came straggling by chance ships from China, Valparaiso, Callao, and the Sandwich Islands.

The Adjutant General of the army, afterwards from Washington, sent across land, by Kit Carson, F. X. Aubrey, and Roubideaux, a few official letters once a year by way of Fort Leavenworth, Santa Fé, Los Angeles, etc., starting usually in September of each year and reaching our headquarters at Monterey in May of the following year. That was the surest and most expeditious way we in California could receive letters from our Eastern friends in 1847, 1848, and part of 1849.

As soon as General S. W. Kearney had established his headquarters in Monterey (March, 1847), he ordered the quartermaster, Captain Folsom, at Yerba Buena (now San Francisco) to establish a semi-monthly mail from San Francisco to San Diego, a distance of 500 miles. Captain Folsom divided the route into four parts—San Francisco to Monterey, Monterey to "Dana's" (Nepoma), Dana's to Los Angeles, and Los Angeles to San Diego. This was the first regular mail-route ever established on the Pacific Coast. General Kearney, in May, 1847, returned to what we then called the United States, leaving Colonel R. B. Mason, First Dragoons, in his place, and me as his Adjutant General. All reports, messages, etc., came to me, and I had a small adobe house, with a negro boy, "Jim," who was supposed to take care of me. The mail-rider from Monterey to Dana's was an old trapper, Jim Beckworth, a counterpart of Jim Bridger, except that Beckworth was a cross between a *voyageur* of Canada and a Crow Indian, and was, in my estimate, one of the best chroniclers of events on the plains that I have ever encountered, though his reputation for veracity was not good.

Some time in the fall of 1848 I was seated in my room at Monterey when Jim Beckworth came in with his saddle-bags of mail, and exclaimed: "Leftenant, they killed them all, not even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sparing the baby." "Jim," said I, "what the devil are you talking about? None of your lies now!" "I tell you, Leftenant," repeated Jim, "that they killed them all, not even sparing the baby."

After overhauling the mail of letters from San Diego, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, etc., most of which it was my duty to forward by another express messenger to Yerba Buena, I naturally turned to Jim Beckworth. "What is this you report?" With an earnestness not to be mistaken, he reiterated: "Leftenant, I tell you that Reed at San Miguel is killed, all his family and servants, not excepting the baby." He then told me, with a vividness of detail not exceeded by Dickens, how he had received his mail at Dana's, had ridden to San Luis Obispo, and so on to San Miguel. Approaching this mission at night, he observed the absence of the usual lights. Still he drove his two spare horses into the interior corral, hitched his own to a post, went as usual into the kitchen for his supper, and saw the Indian cook, as he supposed, on the floor asleep. Trying to arouse him, he found his own hand covered with warm blood. Then, fully alarmed, he regained his horse and went on to the nearest ranche, some five miles off, gathered a few friends, and returned to the mission. Hiding their horses in the orchard, they crept up to the Mission of San Miguel and gained the kitchen; the body of the cook was gone, but it had left a trace, which they followed to a back building, where were piled, along with old beams and rafters, the dead bodies of Reed, his wife, children, and servants, all murdered, and meant to be consumed, along with the mission itself, by the murderers. The whole scene was so horrid that Jim Beckworth, though he had spent his whole life with Indians and hunters, confessed that he was *scared*, that he regained his horse down in the orchard, and did not stop till he reached me, ninety miles away at Monterey. Satisfied that he was telling me as near the truth as Jim Beckworth could, I took him to the quarters of Colonel R. B. Mason, commanding the Department, where he repeated the same story. Colonel Mason instructed me to go up to the Fort on the hill and order Lieutenant Ord to take a detachment of soldiers, to proceed with all possible dispatch to San Miguel, to ascertain the facts, and to pursue the murderers to the death. This event occurred during the Mexican war, when the military power in California was superior to the civil, though we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tolerated Judges of the First Instance, Alcaldes, etc., to administer civil justice among the people, who universally spoke the Spanish language and respected the old Mexican laws. Also, at that date, everybody travelled on horseback, usually with three horses to one rider, two driven ahead and one under saddle. Thus our habit was to make ten leagues, or thirty miles, a day, and if necessity required as much as a hundred miles a day, always at a gallop, without baggage or food, except "jerked beef" and "pinole" (parched corn) tied to the saddle. Lieutenant Ord, with his detachment, was off before midnight, reached San Miguel, ninety miles, the next day, found Jim Beckworth's story true, got the trail of the murderers, which led south by Santa Inez, back of Santa Barbara, and at the Rinconada, twenty-five miles south, he overtook the party, who proved to be four deserters from the sloop-of-war "Warren," lying in the harbor of Monterey. They had a running fight, in which Ord lost one of his men, killed the ringleader, and captured the other three men. These three confessed everything, and, as usual, threw off the crime on their dead comrade, their "nameless leader."

Gold was discovered at Sutter's Sawmill, Coloma, early in 1848. In the autumn of that year, no story was too big to be swallowed. Soldiers and sailors believed that men at the mines were shovelling gold in bags by the ton, and they deserted their posts and their ships to share in this "bonanza." Four men deserted from the United States sloop-of-war "Warren," at Monterey, with little or no knowledge of geography, but impelled by the universal greed for gold. By some means they got horses, only worth from $5 to $8 apiece, and on an evening of October, 1848, found themselves near the old mission of San Miguel. This mission had been leased from the padre, or priest, by an Irishman named Reed, with a native wife, half a dozen children and servants, a few horses, cattle, and sheep. He had been to the mines with a flock of sheep, which he sold at a gold ounce—$16—apiece, when a few months before they were only worth $1.25 apiece.

These deserters unsaddled and picketed their horses in the valley, where the grass was good, walked up to the mission, and were received by Reed, as always, most hospitably. The mission was, like all others in California, built in a quadrangle, enclosing a space used as a corral for cattle, horses, or sheep. The front

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

included the church, the residence of the priest, and of the *gente de razon*, the quality or better class. The sides of the quadrangle sheltered the neophytes, the workmen and women of the mission, and the rear building, facing inwards, generally served as work-shops, store-rooms, etc., etc. About the middle of the main front was a gate closed at night, making the whole defensible. All the buildings were habitually of one story, except the church, were of adobes (sun-dried bricks), with tile roofs, dirt floors, and barred windows, projecting or porch roofs inside. Such was the mission of San Miguel in the fall of 1848.

When these four men came, Reed received them in his accustomed manner, gave them supper, and invited them to share his hospitality. In one corner of his room was a fireplace with chimney, not usual at that date, and behind in the same room was a pile of wood with an axe. In that same room was an ordinary *seaman's chest*. Sitting by this fire smoking their pipes, Reed naturally inquired: "Boys, where are you going?" Their leader answered: "We are deserters from the sloop-of-war 'Warren,' anchored at Monterey, and we are bound for the gold mines." Reed said: "You are on the wrong road; you should have gone by St. Juan Bautista, by Pacheco's, etc., to the Stanislaus." The leader said they had taken this the longer road to avoid the chances of capture.

Then a general conversation ensued about the gold mines. Reed said he had been there, and the miners were making piles of gold. He had sold sheep for $16 not worth more than a dollar and a quarter a few months before, and intimated that the *seaman's chest* contained the results of his speculation. The leader of these deserters went back to the wood-pile, seemingly to replenish the fire, but took the axe, approached Reed from behind, and clove his skull. Then ensued pandemonium. The mother and her babe in the next room, the children begging for their lives, and, finally, the servants, including the cook, *all—all*—were murdered. Then came the sound of Jim Beckworth, with his two extra mail horses. The deserters naturally hid themselves, but when Jim had found the cook with fresh blood, and had departed, they searched the mission for gold. The seaman's chest contained little or no gold; only some presents of calico which Reed had bought for his children. They then dragged the bodies to the rear building, piled them up with old rafters, intending to burn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mission, and thereby efface all traces of their guilt. The opportune return of Jim Beckworth, with his posse of rancheros, again disturbed them. They regained their horses and fled south.

As before stated, Lieutenant Ord, afterwards Brigadier-General E. O. C. Ord, of the regular army, overtook them at the Angustura Pass, below Santa Barbara, killed the leader, took the other three back to Santa Barbara, and delivered them to the Alcalde, Lewis Dent, brother of Mrs. General Grant.

They all made full confessions, had a fair trial, and were sentenced to be shot. They *were* shot, Lieutenant Ord and his detachment present, but not assisting ; and no men ever better deserved death than these three. When Lieutenant Ord returned to Monterey and reported what he had done, Col. R. B. Mason, a strict constructionist, doubted Ord's right to assist in what he construed as an unlawful act ; but I always contended that my orders to Ord to follow the murderers "to the death" were Colonel Mason's orders, and were absolute and final. At all events, time has settled this question forever.

California, from 1848 to 1888, passed through all the phases of civilization which England did in the past thousand years. In 1846 it was an outlying Mexican Province. At that time there was not a shod horse in California, not a tavern, hotel, or even a common wagon road. We travelled by trails, on horseback, sleeping by the roadside, eating jerked meat or game shot with our rifles ;—and now California has *better* hotels, *better* markets, more convenient appurtenances for travel than London, Paris, or Vienna, and as good stores, factories, and machine-shops.

When I first rode into Yerba Buena, now San Francisco, in 1847, I could not command a roof, a common meal, or even buy oats, barley, or hay for my tired horse. *Now*, anybody can obtain a good carriage, hotel, and room as luxurious as can be found in the world. By the law of virtual velocities this transition has been sudden, violent, and necessary. The existence of San Francisco on the Pacific coast was demanded by the civilization of the whole world,—a necessary link between Europe, America, Japan, China, etc. Mexico was not equal to accomplish this task, and we of the United States have the right to claim the perfect fulfilment of a noble task in the grand march of civilization which must encompass the globe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it is not of this problem that I now want to treat, but of episodes which have marked its progress up to the present moment, leaving to others to fulfill Burns's prophecy that "man to man, the world o'er, shall brothers be."

The recent death of Admiral Baldwin in this city recalls to my memory a most interesting incident, and one illustrative of the development of civilization on the Pacific Coast.

As soon as the United States had become possessed of California, arrangements for a more perfect communication with it were begun, even before the discovery of gold had attracted world-wide attention. A contract was made for a monthly steamship line from New York and New Orleans to California by way of Panama. The first of these steamers, the "California," reached Monterey, February 23, 1849; the next, the "Oregon," in March, and the "Panama" in April. Thereafter we had a monthly mail to the "United States." Of this line Wm. H. Aspinwall & Co. became the owners. Subsequently a rival line was established by way of Nicaragua, of which Mr. Vanderbilt was the chief owner. Being in San Francisco in the autumn of 1853, and having business in St. Louis and New York, I took passage by way of Nicaragua in the side-wheeler "Brother Jonathan," of which Lieutenant Baldwin, U. S. Navy, was the captain. He may have resigned from the Navy before that date, but he was every inch a sailor, a gentle man, a type of the school in which he had been reared, and the same who, when a midshipman, had been relieved by us of the command of that block-house at Monterey in 1847.

Our voyage down the coast was uneventful, with about one hundred and fifty first-class passengers going home from California and about four hundred and fifty steerage passengers. When off the coast of Lower California, one morning, Baldwin and I were standing on the hurricane deck near the pilot-house when we noticed some commotion and unusual noise among the steerage passengers on the deck below,—the spar deck,—and presently a strong, stout man, who had a rope around his neck, was shoved forward by a crowd of angry men, and one of the steerage passengers had shinned up the jack-staff at the very bow, where was a cross-jack, over which the rope was passed, and in five minutes more that man would have been struggling as from a gallows. Baldwin called out, "What are you men about?" but not the least attention was paid to him. He was then at his prime, about thirty-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one years of age. He jumped to the lower deck, seized a handspike from the rail, and felled three or four of the ringleaders, all the time calling on the steerage passengers to desist, and for his mates and crew to come to his help. At last there was a pause, and one of the steerage passengers spoke to him : "Captain, this man is a gambler, a rascal, a thief duly convicted, and we mean to hang him." Baldwin replied : "This is a United States ship. I am Captain and you are passengers. That flag which is at the peak is sacred. No violence shall be done one of my passengers without my consent. Take off that rope and leave me to be the judge." "No ! Captain, we respect you, but we intend to hang this man." Through this delay the mates, crew, and cabin passengers had come to the relief of the captain ; the noose was taken from the neck of the trembling man and he was safely escorted to a lower state-room, and there securely guarded. Then the angry men told Captain Baldwin that the man he had rescued from certain death was a well-known gambler of San Francisco; that he was the owner of a nugget of gold nominally worth about five hundred dollars; that, being "short," he had offered it for sale to his fellow-passengers, and had finally put it up to raffle,—fifty chances at ten dollars a chance ; that it had been won by a young lad from Illinois, who was returning home as poor as he went, and who was so overjoyed at winning this prize, which he could take home to his grandmother, that he went around to show it to his fellow-passengers. I remember his coming to me, his face beaming with satisfaction, but he afterwards showed it to a doctor who was more suspicious, and who with his knife-blade detached some pieces of quartz, and developed the fact that the "nugget of gold" was only lead coated with gold by electricity. The boy was correspondingly indignant at this palpable swindle, aroused the passions of his fellow steerage passengers, and these would have hung that man in another five minutes had not Captain Baldwin interposed. The gambler claimed that he had bought the nugget in San Francisco, had, himself, been imposed on, and showed a bill of sale. After some negotiation, Baldwin consented to an investigation, which resulted in a regular "miners' court" on the hurricane deck of the "Brother Jonathan." An old gentleman named Kelly, the same who owned Kelly's Island in Lake Erie, famous for its grapes, was chosen as judge, a good jury of twelve men was impanelled, a prosecuting attorney

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was appointed, and the prisoner was allowed to choose his own counsel. Baldwin had the awning spread, and chairs and benches for the court, witnesses, and spectators, of whom I was one; and I have rarely seen a more dignified court. The testimony was full and complete, the arguments of counsel were really brilliant, the charge of the judge dignified; and the jury retired. In due time the foreman sent word that the jury had come to a verdict. All again assembled on that hurricane deck, and the verdict was rendered: "Guilty; the worthless nugget to be cast into the sea; the money the gambler had actually received to be given to the Illinois boy (about $350), and the gambler to be punished with hickory withes as soon as he got ashore in Nicaragua." The result was that Captain Baldwin maintained the honor and discipline of his ship, the boy got the net proceeds of the lottery, and as there is not a "hickory withe" within a thousand miles of Nicaragua, I infer that that gambler got off without a beating.

It is matter of history that I, individually and officially, opposed the Vigilance Committee of San Francisco in 1856, because I believed the time had passed for such extreme measures; that the courts, especially Judge Norton's, were better qualified to try the cases which caused so much feeling than any which could be devised by the Vigilance Committee; and I knew that the Governor of the State, J. Neely Johnson, was resolved to execute the lawful sentences of the courts.

Absolute and perfect obedience to the Constitution of the United States is, and should be, the duty and pride of every good citizen. The fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth amendments guarantee to the vilest criminal protection till duly convicted, and to no single man or community is given the right to set aside these fundamental principles of eternal justice.

In due time the "Brother Jonathan" reached San Juan del Sur, and we all scrambled to get across to Greytown and home. I have seen none of these people since; but with Baldwin as Midshipman, Lieutenant, Captain, Commodore, and Admiral, I have been associated ever since; and but a few weeks ago I saw the casket inclosing his body lowered into an honored tomb.

If our Government will continue to encourage such men, no American need entertain a doubt of the future of his country.

Wholesale murders, mobs, miners' courts, and vigilance committees have long ceased in California. We go there to-day in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

palace cars, with every luxury and comfort, in less than one week, knowing that for a reasonable consideration the Palace, Baldwin, Cosmopolitan, and Lick hotels will receive us, and give better entertainment than the Grand of Paris or Langham of London. Justice and law are as well enforced there as here in New York, and all the manufactures, trade, and business are conducted on a scale which fully measures the demand.

Such transformations have not occurred in the same time since the creation of the earth, and seem more like the fables of the Arabian Nights than a reality; yet these things are the creations of American energy. Nothing but the folly of man can check this progress, and the modern Ku-Klux and White Caps should take warning, and join in this general advance by honest, persistent methods rather than by spasmodic attempts. Let them reform themselves and take the beam out of their own eyes before seeking the mote in others,—a measure sanctioned by high authority.

W. T. SHERMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ASSASSINATION AS A POLITICAL ARGUMENT.

BY LOGAN S. ROOTS, OF ARKANSAS.

JOHN M. CLAYTON was no ordinary man. Both his head and heart were large and active, his abilities were not inferior to those of his honored brothers, and as to elements of personal popularity he was richly endowed. For as many years as he would accept the office of sheriff of the wealthy and populous county in which he resided he was elected by large majorities. Not only did all the Republicans vote for him, but his majority was augmented by the votes of many of the most pronounced and respected Democrats, including such as that of the Democratic Congressman.

In the last election he made the race for Congressional honors with his fellow-townsman, the Hon. Clifton R. Breckinridge, of eloquent tongue and illustrious lineage. The official announcement of the result of the election gave Breckinridge the certificate by a majority of 846. Numerous unlawful acts contributing to this result were committed, and Clayton felt it to be his duty to institute a contest for the seat in Congress, to which he and many others believed that by the votes cast he had been fairly elected.

At the town of Plummerville, in Conway County, on the night of election day, the ballot box, containing about five hundred majority for Clayton, was carried away by four armed masked men. Other events subsequently occurred in this vicinity which gave warning that Clayton's contest might become a dangerous undertaking; but John M. Clayton, when warned of the danger, said he was not willing to believe it existed, but, in any event, he believed it his duty to uncover the facts; therefore he would attend the taking of evidence, even if it were at the risk of his life. Some days had been spent in investigating; Clayton looked after his own interests, Breckinridge being represented by a resident attorney. The testimony proved facts favorable to Clayton.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While on this mission, on the night of the 29th of January, in the midst of apparently peaceful surroundings, Clayton was, without apprehension, passing the evening with others in his room at his boarding-house, while outside his window a stealthy assassin waited his opportunity with deliberate murderous intent. Just as Clayton was in the act of sitting down at a table near the window to write a letter to his motherless family, a gun was fired; a crash was heard; the Clayton-Breckinridge contest was ended; a soul was sent unshriven before the final Judge; a pure heart was expending its last throbs in wasting, through the ghastly wound made by the cruel assassin, the blood from the speechless form of John M. Clayton.

And now the Editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW invites me to express my views of the cause and effects of this murder, and the best means of preventing similar occurrences. There are peculiarly embarrassing environments to me in touching upon this atrocious crime, which, together with the inconsiderate haste that the early date of going to press makes necessary, causes me to approach the subject with misgivings as to my ability to write what shall prove satisfactory to either reader or writer.

As to the cause, I prefer simply to present the honest editorial views of the two leading Democratic Arkansas daily papers, as follows:

THE FRUIT OF FRAUD.

The cold-blooded assassination at Plummerville on Tuesday night is the fruit of ballot-box robbery. The story is a short one and it may do some good to repeat it. At the September election there were notorious frauds upon the ballot in this State in several counties—the worst by far being perpetrated in this, the capital county, where the safe in the county clerk's office was robbed of nine ballot-boxes, which, if counted, would have elected the entire opposition ticket, with the exception of county clerk and county judge. This flagrant outrage was followed by the stealing of a ballot-box in Howard Township, Conway County, at the Congressional election in November. This township was known to have cast a large majority for the Republican candidate, Hon. John M. Clayton. In the investigation which followed, Col. Clayton went to Plummerville to take testimony in the case and was assassinated in cold blood.—*Arkansas Democrat.*

THE FRUIT OF CORRUPT POLITICS.

The foulest blot on the page of Arkansas history is the assassination of Col. John M. Clayton. . . .

Colonel Clayton was proceeding quietly to gather testimony on which to base his contest for a seat in Congress. The nature of the inquiry he was prosecuting was not of the sort that leads to violence or provokes crime. The voters of the township were merely being put through an inquiry as to how they voted on the sixth of November. There had not been the least rupture between any of the parties concerned; so that the hand that committed this act was impelled to do it by motives as coolly and deliberately formed and carried out as ever plotted assassination.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This foul act follows the stealing of the ballot-box in that township on the night of the November election as naturally as darkness follows the setting sun. It is a political crime that would not have occurred had Colonel Clayton not been there prosecuting a political contest. It is the natural development of corrupt politics, and it is shocking enough, and horrible enough, and damaging enough to the State of Arkansas and the whole South to cause a revolution that shall root out the last vestige of crime from our politics, let it cost what it may.—*Arkansas Gazette.*

I desire, however, to say that the mass of the people of Arkansas have never had any sympathy with election frauds; there is always before the eyes of the beneficiary of lawlessness a vail that modifies the heinousness of a crime. Politicians who have been beneficiaries of fraudulent practices in the management of elections have consoled themselves with the idea that in each particular instance the end justified the means. This state of mind, in my opinion, is with them a disease like color-blindness, that may exist while the system otherwise is in perfect condition, and when the afflicted does not realize the infirmity.

I shall not discuss the responsibility of party leaders, who have reasons for what they do, and who, though they may not instigate the crime, can by a word create a sentiment that would prevent the enjoyment of the fruits of election frauds. I have lived with these Arkansas people in such intimate relationship, and have enjoyed so greatly their warm friendships, that I must enter my most emphatic contradiction of the theory, that many seem conscientiously to entertain, to the effect that this murder is proof that the Democratic party of Arkansas, severally and collectively, premeditate, plan, and promote such crimes.

The effects are manifold and immeasurable. As the murder of Lovejoy in Southern Illinois retarded the progress of that region for a quarter of a century, and largely contributed to the circumstances which gave to that end of Illinois the appellation of Egypt, so will the unfortunate, atrocious murder of Clayton inflict injury upon Arkansas that will not be fully eradicated during the present generation. But terribly cruel as is the crime, the effects are not all evil. It is a sin from which there are good results. So appalling was the crime, so prominent the victim, that the whole Nation is shocked, and Arkansans realize, as they never would without some extraordinary occurrence, that as certainly as rivulets flow to the river and the river to the sea, so surely will unrebuked irregularities lead to unbridled lawlessness and appalling crimes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Democratic United States Senator, whose ideas on other than political subjects are so pure and correct that I would, on leaving the world, appoint him, with perfect confidence, executor to manage my estate and care for my wife and daughters, told me since the election that the people of the South would not permit unworthy persons to hold office, either county, State, or National. He made this statement with such peculiar emphasis as to leave no doubt whatever that he believed the Guiteau plan of "removal" was to be practised; and now that so good a man as Clayton has been thus "removed" from contesting for the Congressional seat, that Senator has announced his abhorrence of the crime in such a manner as convinces me that he concludes it will not do to trust to the murderer to decide whether or not the Republican selected to office is an "unworthy person." He may see that if the same person is to be judge and executioner, he may attempt now to remove one of the opposition party, and at the next election feel justified in murdering the member of an opposite political faction in his own party; and, if so, he would be likely to select a prominent leader—for it is written, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." A small crevice in the dike, left unchecked, leads to certain devastation; and if this harrowing crime convinces the Democratic leaders of the South that irregularities in elections lead to results which, in their own estimation, are more appalling than the holding of office by persons whom they consider unworthy, great good will be the result.

No person, who has not lived in the South, can possibly appreciate the force with which appeal is made to race prejudices; nor can he possibly understand the intensity of the feeling aroused by the fear of negro domination. If he could, he would then be able to form some conception of the force of an appeal to the white race to do whatever is necessary to prevent the ascendency of the party with which the negro largely votes. In Arkansas, however, where the percentage of negro population is smallest, and of the white Northern-born population largest, of all the States south of Mason and Dixon's line, reason is gaining ground in its contest with prejudice. In the last election, the candidate for Governor nominated by the Wheelers, and voted for by the Republicans, received such a large vote that he fully believes he was rightfully elected. Business enterprise is also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

causing thousands to break loose from the dictates of prejudice, and to work to promote a free ballot and a fair count. The encouragement of manufactures; the incoming of Northern life, energy, and capital to enjoy and utilize our genial climate, great wasted water-powers, wonderful undeveloped minerals, unsurpassed, fertile, uncultivated lands, and other unexcelled natural resources, are aiding to redeem the State. If this great crime shall arouse the people to the realization of the disastrous results of prejudice, it will accelerate the progress of the various movements prompted by reason and enterprise.

The bold and praiseworthy manner in which the Democratic press has commented upon the crime is, necessarily, having a greatly beneficial educational influence. The Governor has exhibited a determination to do all that an earnest Christian executive can do. The Legislature has passed an enactment enabling him to offer a reward of five thousand dollars more for the apprehension of the murderer than he was able to do under pre-existing laws. The individual citizens have subscribed funds liberally to give encouragement to the efforts to apprehend the murderer, and though the immediate community may appear to present only blunt sensibilities, yet the great mass of the people of the State are in sympathy with the movement to make the crime odious.

Usually, when a disease is properly diagnosed, the remedy is easily ascertainable ; but this is not the case with the general subject that this special incident presents with painful forcibleness to the thought of every intelligent patriot, regardless of geographical location.

The cowardly murder of Clayton was committed by a person whose first stifling of conscience for political purposes did not embrace assassination. At the polls the judges of election had been interfered with, without denunciation by the people of the community. The ballot-box was stolen, for which no person was arrested ; and, finally, when the assasination followed, the people in the vicinity naturally did not realize the enormity of the crime.

The citizens of Arkansas are not naturally lawless. When there is a real heart-felt belief that it is as much a crime to steal a ballot-box as to steal a horse; as much a perjury to swear falsely concerning election returns as to swear to any other false statement ; when fraud-tainted and blood-stained claims to office shall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be valid, and when all transgressions, great or small, affecting elections, which would be crimes, if done for the accomplishment of results in other walks of life, shall be considered as crimes when enacted for political purposes, then the disease will be entirely eradicated.

Some thoughtful persons believe that the great panacea is the education of the ignorant masses. I, too, believe that the troubles increase with the decadence of a sincere love of popular education. We have excellent free schools in Arkansas, which are eagerly patronized by our laboring people, and certainly merit all the assistance obtainable. Yet the Legislature of 1883, by an overwhelming majority, recommended the passage by Congress of the act extending National aid to the free schools of the Nation; whereas the Legislature now in session has, by a practically unanimous vote, declared its sentiments against Federal aid to free schools. I do not believe that education can be, solely, a complete remedy, but I believe it is the Nation's duty to exercise liberality in combatting illiteracy, and in every other proper method to promote the elevation of its citizens.

Colonel Shepard is eminently correct, and has struck the popular chord, when announcing in the *Mail and Express* that General Benjamin Harrison is right in saying that such things as the stealing of ballot-boxes and the killing of John M. Clayton must be stopped; but when he says, "If you want one million men to stop them, you can have the Boys in Blue in thirty days' time," he states another truth, which, however, under the circumstances, needs addition, in my opinion. Of course, all our soldiers now dress in blue; but if an army is efficient to enforce obedience to the laws, it will come alike from those who wore the gray and those who wore the blue. The people of the South will say that crime must be punished, anarchists and other murderers must be convicted and hanged, alike in Chicago, Ill., and Plummerville, Ark., and no million men will be needed in one case more than the other. But the obdurate fact is that, no matter how willing the patriotic people of all sections are to enlist for the war, it may well be doubted whether the President can utilize an army for the purposes suggested.

There are physicians and there is a remedy which can, with certainty, cure the disease and absolutely prevent a repetition of such crimes as the especial one under consideration. The Demo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic leaders' influence in the premises can be absolutely controlling. Futile will it be for them to ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?" If they WILL it, from that hour such crimes will be impossible. Their simple wish on this particular subject would be as potential as the fiat of Deity. I cannot but believe that that wish will be uttered. It seems to me the ultimatum is the speeding of a section of our country towards savagery, or the acceleration of its progress to unexampled prosperity.

At the last election a man of remarkable equipoise and noted steadfastness in always doing the right, as God gives him to see the right, was, against great odds, elected to be Chief Magistrate of the Nation; and no other cause did more to secure that result and to elect a United States House of Representatives in sympathy with him than the great, prevailing, heart-felt desire to have American citizenship become, as it should be, the most prized title in the world. No intelligent persons think that the President-elect will be a Louis XVI. or a Charles I.; but they do believe that upon the incoming of the new Administration, "with malice towards none and charity for all," he will be simply the President of all people of all politics in the greatest Republic on earth, under which not only the life of every citizen will be held precious, but the rights of all citizens, of whatever creed, color, or locality, will be maintained so sacredly as to demand love and obedience at home and respect and admiration abroad, and they will thereby become the recipients of blessings from the Supreme Ruler of all nations.

LOGAN S. ROOTS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAS CLAYTON'S MURDER A POLITICAL CRIME?

BY SENATOR JAMES K. JONES, OF ARKANSAS.

SINCE the assassination of President Garfield, no crime committed in this country has caused more deep and wide-spread feeling than the recent murder of Colonel John M. Clayton, and nowhere has this crime been so strongly condemned and keenly felt as in Arkansas.

The entire press of the State is teeming with denunciations of it, and each issue of every paper is demanding the apprehension and punishment of the assassin. Immediately upon the announcement of the terrible event, town-meetings were held, amid the greatest excitement, in all parts of the State, and expressions of the strongest condemnation of the outrage, together with the most vigorous demands for prompt and effective action by the officers of the law, came up from every quarter.

The Governor immediately offered the largest reward for the apprehension of the criminal permissible under the law, and the Legislature promptly passed an act authorizing the offer of an amount fivefold as large—the largest, in fact, ever offered by the State for the arrest of any criminal; and this has been supplemented by rewards offered by individuals and commercial bodies.

The coroner assembled a jury at nine o'clock on the morning after the killing and made a careful examination of the body, its position, surroundings, and the tracks about the window, making every effort to follow up each clew that might lead to detection. Witnesses were sworn and examined, their evidence was taken down, and every effort made to find the offenders and bring them to justice. The dead body of Colonel Clayton was, from the first hour, in the charge and keeping of his attending friend and lawyer. The reported coolness of the people of Plummerville towards his brother, on the next day, was but the unwillingness of a feeling people to obtrude themselves upon the grief of a stranger. Complaint has been made that the sheriff was not promptly on the ground; but in these accusations no mention is made of the fact that his deputy was there, and that on the night of the killing the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sheriff himself was some thirty miles away from the scene of the tragedy, employed in the discharge of public duties, off the railroad, away from any telegraph line, and that it was impossible for him to know anything of the murder until a messenger could reach him on horseback.

The State's attorney for the district went personally to the locality, and has given his counsel and aid to the sheriff in the investigation of the crime. The sheriff has provided himself with every means possible, and is doing all in his power to ferret out the mystery and make known the offenders. The details of this work, of course, cannot be made public now without endangering success; but everything possible has been and will continue to be done.

The Governor and other high State officials, and citizens from all parts of the State, singly and in bodies, attended the funeral; every one present was impressed by the manifestations of deep and earnest feeling on the part of the assembled thousands, and the sincere sympathy expressed for the family of the deceased. By far the greater part of the vast assemblage on that solemn occasion was composed of Democrats, between whom and General Powell Clayton there had existed for years the bitterest political antagonisms. This great gathering and the strong feeling manifested there and all over the State show how completely the people were startled by this horrible crime, their intense feeling toward the guilty, and their profound and tender sympathy for the afflicted family of the dead. This feeling was intensified by the consciousness present in the heart of every one that this base and horrible murder, while inflicting the greatest wrong and suffering upon the children of Colonel Clayton, had also placed a blot upon the good name of our State which even the blood of the guilty could not efface. For years the progress and development of Arkansas have been the source of the greatest pride to her citizens. Immigrants are coming from all quarters of the Union to make their homes with us. The State is increasing in wealth and prosperity; crime has been punished with a certainty that has not been surpassed by any State, if, indeed, the record has been equalled; her public-school system is rapidly developing and advancing, and her people were proudly calling attention to all these things and boasting of the orderly and law-abiding character of her citizens.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is, unfortunately, true that murders are not uncommon under any form of civilization, and many of the most revolting are committed in communities where refinement and cultivation are found, and where the people consider themselves the most favored of the earth. Often the perpetrators of such crimes remain undiscovered and go unpunished; and so it may prove in this case. But if it should be so, it would be a strong circumstance to show that the murderer was careful to keep his own counsel and that the general public has no idea of his identity. If this murder is the result of the depravity of a single man, the act of one individual inspired by personal malice toward the deceased, or urged on by the hope of an advantage to himself only, then it takes its place among, and has no greater significance than, other atrocities committed from time to time by bad men. But there is a conjecture and there are charges that it is something more than this, and thus this crime acquires unusual prominence in the public mind.

Colonel Clayton, a Republican, was assassinated while in the act of prosecuting a contest for a seat in the House of Representatives held by a Democrat. This circumstance gives color to the suggestion that the killing was done for the purpose of putting an end to the contest; but all thinking men know that the effect is, and of necessity must have been, just the reverse. When President Garfield was killed, at a time of great party excitement and the deepest political feeling, the horror felt by all was intensified by the fear that this act might have been the result of a conspiracy among disappointed and malignant partisans, or planned by persons who, consumed by lust of power, hoped to reap advantage from the death of the President. Apparently in that case succession and confirmation of title by death were certain. How different were the circumstances from those attending the killing of Clayton! Here loss and injury, not profit, both to Mr. Breckinridge and the Democratic party, were the certain result of the crime; and yet the world is asked by men, themselves in public life, to believe that our public life has sunk so low, our public men are so base, and our people are such hypocrites and idiots as to do deeds like this with such a purpose in view.

This charge is most readily accepted where least is known of the people of Arkansas. Those who thoroughly understand the people of that State, their nature and characteristics, will feel an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abiding confidence, an absolute conviction, that the murder of Clayton was the act of some poor wretch moved by considerations wholly personal to himself.

In November last, at the Congressional election, when Mr. Breckinridge and Colonel Clayton were opposing candidates, a ballot-box was stolen and destroyed at Plummerville. This box was claimed by Colonel Clayton to have contained five hundred and seventy-two Republican and one hundred and twenty-five Democratic votes. Allowing this claim, and deducting this majority of four hundred and forty-seven for Clayton at this box from Breckinridge's majority in the district, Breckinridge was still elected by three hundred and ninety-nine votes. But it was the destruction of this ballot-box, and not the votes in it, that furnished the real ground of this contest.

I feel safe and justified in saying that there was never at any time, after the returns were in, a doubt in the mind of Mr. Breckinridge, or any of his friends, of his fair, legal, and honest election. That the other side had doubts may be safely inferred from the fact that no notice of contest came to Mr. Breckinridge for a long while; not, in fact, until it was apparent that the next House would be Republican. Even with a Republican House, the friends of Mr. Breckinridge felt no uneasiness as to the result. They were perfecly sure that—even admitting Colonel Clayton's entire claim as to this box—the number of votes claimed there was wholly insufficient to establish Clayton's right to the seat; hence what was going on there gave them no particular concern.

But there was a party who, we may naturally believe, watched the proceedings of Colonel Clayton there with feelings of apprehension. That party was a man or men engaged in the destruction of the ballot-box, and who stood in fear of the penitentiary. While Clayton was collecting evidence in his contest, he is said to have been attended by a detective, and he was, doubtless, patiently and persistently following up every clew that could lead to the punishment of the perpetrators of the outrage. There was something additional to the search after votes. The guilty, of course, would naturally keep a close watch upon these things, and whenever they found themselves being hemmed in, partly, perhaps, from a belief that no one else knew as much as Clayton, and that to kill him would lessen the danger of detection, and partly to gratify a feeling of revenge against the man who, they felt, was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon their track and following them persistently, they doubtless killed him. The instances are many where an effort to conceal one crime has led to others; and this, I submit, is the most reasonable hypothesis upon which this murder can be accounted for. I know it has been charged that this was a "political assassination." If by this is meant only that the act of the criminal, for which he alone is responsible, was connected with political matters, as in the case of Garfield, then I agree that this is true; but if the intention is to make the charge that this assassination was for a political purpose and with a political end in view, then I respectfully submit that it is absolutely untrue, and that there is nothing to sustain it. No fair man would seek to make such an impression,—an impression so discreditable to the State and involving the entire community where the crime occurred,—except upon such proof or reasonable grounds of presumption as are wholly lacking in this case. John M. Clayton was not murdered because he was a Republican, nor because he was a candidate for Congress, nor yet because he was contesting Breckinridge's seat, but he was doubtless murdered by the wretch who destroyed the ballot-box, in order to avoid detection and punishment. There was, perhaps, this much of politics in it, but no more.

The charges implied in the statement that "John M. Clayton went to Plummerville unarmed and unescorted, recognizing the futility of such precautions against the stealthy assassin, and believing that his opponent, Mr. Breckinridge, who was aware of the condition of affairs in this county, would be willing and able to restrain his partisans," no one will openly make. There is much of the spirit of the assassin in covert charges,—in insinuations intended to suggest charges which are known to be untrue. The condition of Conway County was not such as to suggest even the possibility of assassination. This is not a crime characteristic of the Southern people; it is the crime of cowards; and whatever else may have been said against us, we have not been accused of cowardice. The suggestion that Colonel Clayton went to Plummerville with any thought of assassination is wholly gratuitous, and implies the grossest misrepresentation of the people of Conway County, for he had very recently canvassed this and every other county in the district, and had been treated everywhere with kindness and consideration.

The stab at the good name of Mr. Breckinridge in the insinua-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion that he might or could restrain assassins—that he was capable of any sort of affiliation or connection with assassins—is monstrous. A good name is dearer than life itself to an honorable man ; and in all his life, public and private, no spot or blemish is to be found upon his character. His purity and uprightness, his manliness and frankness, are characteristics that no truthful man will deny. He is a man of of marked gentleness, always thoughtful and careful of the rights and feelings of others. He is unselfish and generous to a fault. With him principle and conscience are guides. In the line of his duty he is brave, but always courteous; he "dares do all that may become a man" ; but his worst enemy has never said he would dare do more. Every fair-minded, manly man who knows him well, whether Republican or Democrat, will at once condemn and denounce this insinuation as unjust and untrue—aye, as infamous. The gentleness of his nature appears in that he has preferred to suffer in silence under these foul aspersions rather than, even in defence of his own good name, be drawn into a unseemly wrangle over Clayton's dead body. He will bide his time, never doubting his complete vindication by his fellow-men.

I may be pardoned a word just here as to what was the proper political course for Mr. Breckinridge when he learned of this murder. Friends thought that it would have been proper for him to give expression to his detestation of the crime by resigning his claim to his seat. If he had done so, his opponents, ready to assail whatever position he might assume, could and, I believe, would at once have charged that his purpose in resigning was to avoid an investigation into the election of last November, as well as the killing of Clayton; that at the very first moment when his resignation would stop investigation, he had promptly availed himself of it. As he and his party had been assailed, the thing an honorable and honest man would most desire would be the fullest investigation, and to secure this it was necessary for him to hold his place.

A resignation, too, would have implied a doubt upon his part as to the absolute correctness of his claim to his seat. Believing with all his heart, as did his friends, that he had been fairly elected, entertaining no shadow of doubt of this, he could not, even by implication, give currency to any other idea. Fairly elected, justly entitled to his seat, why should he abandon it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after Clayton's unfortunate death any more than during his lifetime?

He is a Representative. Those who fairly elected him have a right to expect him not only to discharge the duties imposed upon him by the position, but that he will preserve and defend the trust committed to his keeping. He retains, as his duty required him to do, his lawful place, quietly awaiting and inviting the fullest investigation not only for himself, but for his district and his party.

The crime of stealing the ballot-box was the beginning of this trouble. It is the fashion in certain quarters to charge a general state of lawlessness against all the South in this matter of outrages upon the ballot. It will scarcely, however, be forgotten by fair men that this is the sole charge of this kind in Major Breckinridge's entire district, composed of sixteen counties and embracing upward of ten thousand square miles of territory, and that in none of the past Federal elections has there been a rumor of wrong of any kind. If the election was to be carried by such means, they would not have been confined to one box, which contained less than five hundred Republican majority. But this, like the greater crime which followed, was not the act of the community, nor that of the Democratic party; but it was the act of certain unknown persons, and is more generally and more strongly condemned in Arkansas than anywhere else.

Outrages upon the ballot, not of this kind, perhaps, but (I respectfully submit) just as grave and reprehensible, are, unfortunately, too common in all sections of the Union. This, of course, is no excuse for wrong-doing in Arkansas. The honesty, patriotism, and good sense of the American people will correct these wrongs there and elsewhere. The State government set up in Arkansas in utter disregard of the rights and wishes of the people, and maintained by the Federal Government, introduced these nefarious practices there. Since it has been removed and a government by the people organized, few instances of the kind have occurred in the State, and these have been most heartily condemned by our own people. The history of the most favored State shows that crime cannot be entirely suppressed; but Arkansas is as successful in that direction as any other State in the Union; and all fair inquiry will show that the State is, and will continue to be, equal to the regulation of her domestic affairs.

JAMES K. JONES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMANITY'S GAIN FROM UNBELIEF.

BY CHARLES BRADLAUGH, M. P.

As an unbeliever, I ask leave to plead that humanity has been a real gainer from scepticism, and that the gradual and growing rejection of Christianity—like the rejection of the faiths which preceded it—has, in fact, added, and will add, to man's happiness and well-being. I maintain that, in physics, science is the outcome of scepticism, and that general progress is impossible without scepticism on matters of religion. I mean by religion, every form of belief which accepts or asserts the supernatural. I write as a Monist, and use the word "nature" as meaning all phenomena, every phenomenon, all that is necessary for the happening of any and every phenomenon. Every religion is constantly changing, and at any given time is the measure of the civilization attained by what Guizot described as the *juste milieu* of those who profess it. Each religion is slowly, but certainly, modified in its dogma and practice by the gradual development of the peoples amongst whom it is professed. Each discovery destroys in whole or part some theretofore-cherished belief. No religion is suddenly rejected by any people; it is, rather, gradually outgrown. None see a religion die; dead religions are like dead languages and obsolete customs; the decay is long, and, like the glacier-march, is only perceptible to the careful watcher by comparisons extending over long periods. A superseded religion may often be traced in the festivals, ceremonies, and dogmas of the religion which has replaced it. Traces of obsolete religions may often be found in popular customs, in old-wives' stories, and in children's tales.

It is necessary, in order that my plea should be understood, that I should explain what I mean by Christianity; and in the very attempt at this explanation there will, I think, be found strong illustration of the value of unbelief. Christianity in prac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tice may be gathered from its more ancient forms represented by the Roman Catholic and the Greek churches, or from the various churches which have grown up in the last few centuries. Each of these churches calls itself Christian. Some of them deny the right of the others to use the word Christian. Some Christian churches treat, or have treated, other Christian churches as heretics or unbelievers. The Roman Catholics and the Protestants in Great Britain and Ireland have, in turn, been terribly cruel one to the other, and the ferocious laws of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries enacted by the English Protestants against English and Irish Papists are a disgrace to civilization. These penal laws, enduring longest in Ireland, still bear fruit in much of the political mischief and agrarian crime of to-day. It is only the tolerant indifference of scepticism that has repealed, one after the other, most of the laws directed by the Established Christian Church against Papists and Dissenters, and also against Jews and heretics. Church-of-England clergymen have in the past gone to great lengths in denouncing non-conformity; and even in the present day an effective sample of such denunciatory bigotry may be found in a sort of orthodox catechism written by the Rev. F. A. Grace, of Great Barling, Essex, the popularity of which is vouched for by the fact that it has gone through ten editions. This catechism for little children teaches that "dissent is a great sin" and that Dissenters "worship God according to their own evil and corrupt imaginations, and not according to his revealed will, and therefore their worship is idolatrous." Church-of-England Christians and dissenting Christians, when fraternizing amongst themselves, often publicly draw the line at Unitarians, and positively deny that these have any sort of right to call themselves Christians.

In the first half of the seventeenth century, Quakers were flogged and imprisoned in England as blasphemers, and the early Christian settlers in New England, escaping from the persecution of Old-World Christians, showed scant mercy to the followers of Fox and Penn. It is customary, in controversy, for those advocating the claims of Christianity to include all good done by men in nominally Christian countries, as if such good were the result of Christianity, while they contend that the evil which exists prevails in spite of Christianity. I shall try to make out that the ameliorating march of the last few centuries has been initiated by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the heretics of each age, though I quite concede that the men and women denounced and persecuted as infidels by the pious of one century are frequently classed as saints by the pious of a later generation.

What, then, is Christianity? As a system or scheme of doctrine, Christianity may, I submit, not unfairly be gathered from the Old and New Testaments. It is true that some Christians to-day desire to escape from submission to part, at any rate, of the Old Testament; but this very tendency seems to me to be part of the result of the beneficial heresy for which I am pleading. Man's humanity has revolted against Old-Testament barbarism, and, therefore, he has attempted to dissociate the Old Testament from Christianity. Unless Old and New Testaments are accepted as God's revelation to man, Christianity has no higher claim than any other of the world's many religions—if no such claim can be made out for it apart from the Bible. And though it is quite true that some who deem themselves Christians put the Old Testament completely in the background, this is, I allege, because they are outgrowing their Christianity. Without the doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus, Christianity, as a religion, is naught; but unless the story of Adam's fall is accepted, the redemption from the consequences of that fall cannot be believed. Both in Great Britain and in the United States the Old and New Testaments are forced on the people as part of Christianity, for it is blasphemy at common law to deny the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be of divine authority, and such denial is punishable with fine and imprisonment, or even worse. The rejection of Christianity intended throughout this paper is, therefore, the rejection of the Old and New Testaments as being of divine revelation. It is the rejection alike of the authorized teachings of the Church of Rome and of the Church of England, as these may be found in the Bible; the creeds, the encyclicals, the prayer-book, the canons, and the homilies of either or both of these churches. It is the rejection of the Christianity of Luther, of Calvin, and of Wesley.

A ground frequently taken by Christian theologians is that the progress and civilization of the world are due to Christianity, and the discussion is complicated by the fact that many eminent servants of humanity have been nominal Christians of one or other of the sects. My allegation will be that the special service rendered to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human progress by these exceptional men has not been in consequence of their adhesion to Christianity, but in spite of it; and that the specific points of advantage to human kind have been in ratio of their direct opposition to precise Biblical enactments. Take one clear gain to humanity consequent on unbelief—*i. e.*, the abolition of slavery in some countries, the abolition of the slave-trade in most civilized countries, and the tendency to its total abolition. I am unaware of any religion in the world which in the past forbade slavery. The professors of Christianity for ages supported it; the Old Testament repeatedly sanctioned it by special laws; the New Testament has no repealing declaration. Though we are at the close of the nineteenth century of the Christian era, it is only during the past three-quarters of a century that the battle for freedom has been gradually won. It is scarcely a quarter of a century since the famous emancipation amendment was carried to the United States Constitution; and it is impossible for any well-informed Christian to deny that the abolition movement in North America was most steadily and bitterly opposed by the religious bodies in the various States. Henry Wilson, in his "Rise and Fall of the Slave-Power in America"; Samuel J. May, in his "Recollections of the Anti-Slavery Conflict," and J. Greenleaf Whittier, in his poems, alike are witnesses that the Bible and pulpit, the church and its great influence, were used against abolition and in favor of the slave-owner. I know that Christians in the present day often declare that Christianity had a large share in bringing about the abolition of slavery, and this because men professing Christianity were Abolitionists. I plead that those so-called Christian Abolitionists were men and women whose humanity—recognizing freedom for all—was, in this, in direct conflict with Christianity. It is not yet fifty years since the European Christian Powers jointly agreed to abolish the slave trade. What of the effect of Christianity on these Powers in the centuries which had preceded? The heretic Condorcet pleaded powerfully for freedom, whilst Christian France was still slave-holding. For many centuries Christian Spain and Christian Portugal held slaves. Porto Rico freedom is not of long date, and Cuban emancipation is even yet newer. It was a Christian king, Charles V., and a Christian friar, who founded in Spanish America the slave-trade between tho Old World and the New. For some 1,800 years almost all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christians kept slaves, bought slaves, sold slaves, bred slaves, stole slaves. Pious Bristol and godly Liverpool, less than one hundred years ago, openly grew rich on the traffic. During the ninth century Greek Christians sold slaves to the Saracens. In the eleventh century prostitutes were publicly sold in Rome as slaves, and the profit went to the church.

It is said that William Wilberforce was a Christian, but, at any rate, his Christianity was strongly diluted with unbelief. As an Abolitionist, he did not believe Leviticus, c 25, v. 44–46; he must have rejected Exodus, c. 21, v. 2–6; he could not have accepted the many permissions and injunctions by the Bible Deity to his chosen people to capture and hold slaves. In the House of Commons on the 18th of February, 1796, Wilberforce reminded that Christian assembly that infidel and anarchic France had given liberty to the Africans, whilst Christian and monarchic England was "obstinately continuing a system of cruelty and injustice." Wilberforce, whilst advocating the abolition of slavery, found the whole influence of the English court and the great weight of the Episcopal bench against him. George III., a most Christian king, regarded abolition theories with abhorrence, and the Christian House of Lords was utterly opposed to granting freedom to the slave. When Christian missionaries, some sixty-two years ago, preached to Demerara negroes under the rule of Christian England, they were treated by Christian judges, holding commission from Christian England, as criminals for so preaching. A Christian commissioned officer, member of the Established Church of England, signed the auction notices for the sale of slaves as late as the year 1824. In the evidence before a Christian court-martial a missionary is charged with having tended to make the negroes dissatisfied with their condition as slaves, and with having promoted discontent and dissatisfaction amongst the slaves against their lawful masters. For this the Christian judges sentenced the Demerara Abolitionist missionary to be hanged by the neck till he was dead. The judges belonged to the Established Church; the missionory was a Methodist. In this the Church-of-England Christians in Demerara were no worse than Christians of other sects. Their Roman Catholic Christian brethren in St. Domingo fiercely attacked the Jesuits as criminals, because they treated the negroes as though they were men and women, in encouraging "two slaves to separate their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest and safety from that of the gang," whilst orthodox Christians let them couple promiscuously and breed for the benefit of the owners, like any other of their plantation cattle. In 1823 the *Royal Gazette* (Christian) of Demerara said: "We shall not suffer you to enlighten our slaves, who are by law our property, till you can demonstrate that, when they are made religious and knowing, they will continue to be our slaves."

When William Lloyd Garrison, the pure-minded and most earnest Abolitionist, delivered his first anti-slavery address in Boston, Massachusetts, the only building he could obtain in which to speak was the infidel hall owned by Abner Kneeland, the "infidel" editor of the *Boston Investigator*, who had been sent to jail for blasphemy. All the Christian sects had, in turn, refused Mr. Lloyd Garrison the use of the buildings they severally controlled. Lloyd Garrison told me, himself, how honored deacons of a Christian church joined in an actual attempt to hang him. When abolition was advocated in the United States in 1790, the representative from South Carolina was able to plead that the Southern clergy "did not condemn either slavery or the slave-trade," and Mr. Jackson, the representative from Georgia, pleaded that "from Genesis to Revelation" the current was favorable to slavery. Elias Hicks, the brave Abolitionist Quaker, was denounced as an atheist, and less than twenty years ago a Hicksite Quaker was expelled from one of the Southern American legislatures because of the reputed irreligion of these Abolitionist "Friends." When the Fugitive-Slave Law was under discussion in North America, large numbers of clergymen, of nearly every denomination, were found ready to defend this infamous act. Samuel James May, the famous Abolitionist, was driven from the pulpit as irreligious, solely because of his attacks on slave-holding. Northern clergymen tried to induce "silver-tongued" Wendell Phillips to abandon his advocacy of abolition. Southern pulpits rang with praises for the murderous attack on Charles Sumner. The slayers of Elijah Lovejoy were highly-reputed Christian men.

Guizot, notwithstanding that he tries to claim that the Church exerted its influence to restrain slavery, says ("European Civilization," Vol. I., p. 110):

"It has often been repeated that the abolition of slavery among modern people is entirely due to Christians. That, I think, is saying too much. Slavery existed for a long period in the heart of Christian society, without its being particularly aston-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ished or irritated. A multitude of causes, and a great development in other ideas and principles of civilization, were necessary for the abolition of this iniquity of all iniquities."

And my contentation is that this "development in other ideas and principles of civilization" was long retarded by governments in which the Christian Church was dominant. The men who advocated liberty were imprisoned, racked, and burned, so long as the church was strong enough to be merciless. The Rev. Francis Minton, Rector of Middlewich, in his recent earnest volume * on the struggles of labor, admits that "a few centuries ago slavery was acknowledged throughout Christendom to have the divine sanction. . . . Neither the exact cause nor the precise time of the decline of the belief in the righteousness of slavery can be defined. It was, doubtless, due to a combination of causes, one probably being as indirect as the recognition of the greater economy of free labor. With the decline of the belief, the abolition of slavery took place." The institution of slavery was actually existent in Christian Scotland in the seventeenth century, where the white coal-workers and salt-workers of East Lothian were chattels, as were their negro brethren in the Southern States thirty years since, and "went to those who succeeded to the property of the works, and they could be sold, bartered, or pawned." † There is, says J. M. Robertson, "no trace that the Protestant clergy of Scotland ever raised a voice against the slavery which grew up before their eyes. And it was not until 1799, after Republican and irreligious France had set the example, that it was legally abolished."

Take the further gain to humanity consequent on the unbelief, or rather disbelief, in witchcraft and wizardry. Apart from the brutality by Christians towards those suspected of witchcraft, the hindrance to scientific initiative or experiment was incalculably great so long as belief in magic obtained. The inventions of the past two centuries, and especially those of this nineteenth century, might have benefited mankind much earlier and much more largely but for the foolish belief in witchcraft and the shocking ferocity exhibited towards those suspected of necromancy. After quoting a large number of cases of trial and punishment for witchcraft from official records in Scotland, J. M. Robertson

* "Capital and Wages," p. 19.
† "Perversion of Scotland," p. 197.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

says: "The people seem to have passed from cruelty to cruelty, precisely as they became more and more fanatical, more and more devoted to their church, till, after many generations, the slow spread of human science began to counteract the ravages of superstition, the clergy resisting reason and humanity to the last."

The Rev. Mr. Minton* concedes that it is "the advance of knowledge which has rendered the idea of Satanic agency, through the medium of witchcraft, grotesquely ridiculous." He admits that "for more than fifteen hundred years the belief in witchcraft was universal in Christendom," and that "the public mind was saturated with the idea of Satanic agency in the economy of nature." He adds: "If we ask why the world now rejects what was once so unquestioningly believed, we can only reply that advancing knowledge has gradually undermined the belief."

In a letter recently sent to the *Pall Mall Gazette* against modern Spiritualism, Professor Huxley declares "that the older form of the same fundamental delusion—the belief in possession and in witchcraft—gave rise, in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, to persecutions by Christians of innocent men, women, and children, more extensive, more cruel, and more murderous than any to which the Christians of the first three centuries were subjected by the authorities of pagan Rome." And Professor Huxley adds:

> "No one deserves much blame for being deceived in these matters. We are all intellectually handicapped in youth by the incessant repetition of the stories about possession and witchcraft in both the Old and the New Testament. The majority of us are taught nothing which will help us to observe accurately, and to interpret observations with due caution."

The English statute-book under Elizabeth and under James was disfigured by enactments against witchcraft passed under pressure from the Christian churches, which acts have only been repealed in consequence of the disbelief in the Christian precept, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." The statute 1 James I., c. 12, condemned to death "all persons invoking any evil spirits, or consulting, covenanting with, entertaining, employing, feeding, or rewarding any evil spirit," or generally practising any "infernal arts." This was not repealed until the eighteenth century was far advanced. Edison's phonograph would, two hundred and eighty years ago, have insured martyrdom for the

* "Capital and Wages," pp. 15, 16.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inventor; the utilization of electric force to transmit messages around the world would have been clearly the practice of an infernal art. At least, we may plead that unbelief has healed the bleeding feet of science and made the road free for her upward march.

Is it not also fair to urge the gain to humanity which has been apparent in the wiser treatment of the insane consequent on the unbelief in the Christian doctrine that these unfortunates were either examples of demoniacal possession or of special visitation of Deity? For centuries, under Christianity, mental disease was most ignorantly treated. Exorcism, shackles, and the whip were the penalties, rather than the curatives, for mental maladies. From the heretical departure of Pinel, at the close of the last century, to the position of Maudesley to-day, every step illustrates the march of unbelief. Take the gain to humanity in the unbelief, not yet complete, but now largely preponderant, in the dogma that sickness, pestilence, and famine were manifestations of divine anger, the results of which could neither be avoided nor prevented. The Christian churches have done little or nothing to dispel this superstition. The official and authorized prayers of the principal denominations even to-day reäffirm it. Modern study of the laws of health, experiments in sanitary improvements, more careful application of medical knowledge, have proved more efficacious in preventing or diminishing plagues and pestilence than have the intervention of the priest or the practice of prayer. Those in England who hold the old faith that prayer will suffice to cure disease are to-day termed "peculiar people," and are occasionally indicted for manslaughter, when their sick children die, because the parents have trusted to God instead of appealing to the resources of science.

It is certainly clear gain to astronomical science that the church which tried to compel Galileo to unsay the truth, has been overborne by the growing unbelief of the age, even though our little children are yet taught that Joshua made the sun and moon stand still, and that for Hezekiah the sun-dial reversed its record. As Buckle, arguing for the morality of scepticism, says: *

"As long as men refer the movements of the comets to the immediate finger of God, and as long as they believe that an eclipse is one of the modes by which the

* "History of Civilization," Vol. I., p. 345.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deity expresses his anger, they will never be guilty of the blasphemous presumption of attempting to predict such supernatural appearances. Before they could dare to investigate the causes of these mysterious phenomena, it is necessary that they should believe, or, at all events, that they should suspect, that the phenomena themselves were capable of being explained by the human mind."

As in astronomy, so in geology, the gain of the knowledge to humanity has been almost solely in measure of the rejection of the Christian theory, a century since almost universally held, that the world was created six thousand years ago, or, at any rate, that by the sin of the first man, Adam, death commenced about that period. Ethnology and anthropology have only been possible in so far as, adopting the regretful words of Sir W. Jones, "intelligent and virtuous persons are inclined to doubt the authenticity of the documents delivered by Moses concerning the primitive world."

Surely it is clear gain to humanity that unbelief has sprung up against the divine right of kings; that men no longer believe that the monarch is "God's anointed," or that "the powers that be are ordained of God." In the struggles for political freedom, the weight of the church was mostly thrown on the side of the tyrant. The homilies of the Church of England declare that "even the wicked rulers have their power and authority from God," that "such subjects as are disobedient or rebellious against their princes, disobey God and procure their own damnation." It can scarcely be necessary to argue to the citizens of the United States of America that the origin of their liberties was in the rejection of this faith in the divine right of George III. Will any one, save the most bigoted, contend that it is not certain gain to humanity to spread unbelief in the terrible doctrine that eternal torment is the probable fate of the great majority of the human family? Is it not gain to have diminished the faith that it was the duty of the wretched and the miserable to be content with the lot in life which Providence had awarded them?

If it stood alone, it would be almost sufficient to plead, as justification for heresy, the approach towards equality and liberty for the utterance of all opinions achieved because of growing unbelief. At one period in Christendom each government acted as though only one religious faith could be true, and as though the holding, or, at any rate, the making known, of any other opinion was a criminal act deserving punishment. Under the one word, "infidel," even as late as Lord Coke, were classed together all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who were not Christians, even though they were Mohommedans, Brahmans, or Jews. All who did not accept the Christian faith were sweepingly denounced as infidels and, therefore, *hors de la loi.* One hundred and forty-five years since, the Attorney General, pleading in our highest court, said* : "What is the definition of an infidel? Why, one who does not believe in the Christian religion. Then a Jew is an infidel." And English history for several centuries prior to the Commonwealth shows how, habitually and most atrociously, Christian kings, Christian courts, and Christian churches persecuted and harassed these infidel Jews. There was a time in England when Jews were such infidels that they were not even allowed to be sworn as witnesses. In 1740, a legacy left for establishing an assembly for the reading of the Jewish Scriptures was held to be void † because it was "for the propagation of the Jewish law in contradiction to the Christian religion." It is only in very modern times that municipal rights have been accorded in England to Jews. It is barely thirty years since they have been allowed to sit in Parliament. In 1851, the late Mr. Newdegate, in debate, ‡ objected "that they should have sitting in that House an individual who regarded our Redeemer as an impostor." Lord Chief Justice Raymond has shown ‖ how it was that Christian intolerance was gradually broken down: "A Jew may sue at this day, but heretofore he could not; for then they were looked upon as enemies, but now commerce has taught the world more humanity." Lord Coke treated the infidel as one who, in law, had no right of any kind, with whom no contract need be kept, to whom no debt was payable. The plea of "alien infidel," as answer to a claim, was actually pleaded in court as late as 1737.§ In a solemn judgment Lord Coke says** : "All infidels are, in law, *perpetui inimici,* for between them, as with the devils whose subjects they be, and the Christians, there is perpetual hostility." Twenty years ago the law of England required the writer of any periodical, publication, or pamphlet under sixpence in price to give sureties for eight hundred pounds against the publication of blasphemy. I was the last person prosecuted, in 1868, for non-

Omychund vs. Barker, 1 Atkyns, 29.
† D'Costa vs. D'Pays, Amb., 228.
‡ 3 Hansard, cxvi., 381.
‖ 1 Lord Raymond's Reports. 282, Wells vs. Williams.
§ Ramkijsenseat vs. Barker, 1 Atkyns, 51.
** Coke's reports, Calvin's case.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compliance with that law, which was repealed by Mr. Gladstone in 1869. Up till the 23d of December, 1888, an infidel in Scotland was only allowed to enforce any legal claim in court on condition that, if challenged, he denied his infidelity. If he lied and said that he was a Christian, he was accepted, despite his lying. If he told the truth and said that he was an unbeliever, then he was practically an outlaw, incompetent to give evidence for himself or for any other. Fortunately, all this was changed by the royal assent to the Oaths Act on the 24th of December. Has not humanity clearly gained a little in this struggle through unbelief ?

For more than a century and a half the Roman Catholic had, in practice, harsher measure dealt out to him by the English Protestant Christian than was, even during that period, the fate of the Jew or the unbeliever. If the Roman Catholic would not take the oath of abjuration, which, to a sincere Romanist, was impossible, he was, in effect, an outlaw, and the "jury-packing," so much complained of to-day in Ireland, is one of the survivals of the old, bad time when Roman Catholics were thus, by law, excluded from the jury-box.

The *Scotsman* of January 5, 1889, notes that, in 1860, the Rev. Dr. Robert Lee, of Greyfriars, gave a course of Sunday evening lectures on Biblical Criticism, in which he showed the absurdity and untenableness of regarding every word in the Bible as inspired, and adds:

"We well remember the awful indignation such opinions inspired, and it is refreshing to contrast them with the calmness with which they are now received. Not only from the pulpits of the city, but from the press (misnamed religious) were his doctrines denounced. And one eminent U. P. minister went the length of publicly praying for him, and for the students under his care. It speaks volumes for the progress made since then, when we think that, in all probability, Dr. Charteris, Dr. Lee's successor in the chair, differs, in his teaching, from the Confession of Faith much more widely than Dr. Lee ever did, and yet he is considered supremely orthodox, whereas the stigma of heresy was attached to the other all his life."

And this change and gain to humanity are due to the gradual progress of unbelief alike inside and outside the churches. Take, from differing churches, two recent illustrations. The late Principal, Dr. Lindsay Alexander, a strict Calvinist, in his important work on "Biblical Theology," claims that "all the statements of Scripture are alike to be deferred to, as presenting to us the mind of God." Yet the Reverend Doctor of Divinity also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

says: "We find in their writings [*i. e.*, in the writings of the sacred authors] statements which no ingenuity can reconcile with what modern research has shown to be the scientific truth." At the last Southwell Diocesan Church-of-England Conference, at Derby, the Bishop of the Diocese presiding, the Rev. J. G. Richardson said of the Old Testament that "it was no longer honest, or even safe, to deny that this noble literature, rich in all the elements of moral or spiritual grandeur, given—so the Church had always taught and would always teach—under the inspiration of Almighty God, was sometimes mistaken in its science, was sometimes inaccurate in its history, and sometimes relative and accommodatory in its morality. It resumed theories of the physical world which science had abandoned and could never resume; it contained passages of narrative which devout and temperate men pronounced discredited both by external and internal evidence; it praised, or justified, or approved, or condoned, or tolerated conduct which the teaching of Christ and the conscience of the Christian alike condemned." Or—as I should urge—the gain to to humanity by unbelief is that the "teaching of Christ" has been modified, enlarged, widened, and humanized, and that "the conscience of the Christian" is, in quantity and quality, made fitter for the ever-increasing additions of knowledge of these later and more heretical days.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DELIA BACON'S UNHAPPY STORY.

BY THE HON. IGNATIUS DONNELLY.

THIS book* contains the saddest, the most pathetic, the most tragic story ever told in the history of literature. But that which we read between the lines is infinitely sadder and more touching than that which appears on the surface of the narrative. It is not alone a biography of one of the greatest and most unhappy of Americans,—a woman of noble heart, penetrating intellect, and profound genius; but it is told by one who, however related to the subject of the narrative by ties of kindred, has not the slightest sympathy with the cause for which she sacrificed her happiness and her life; by one who, in fact, rather justifies the blows by which she was driven to the mad-house and the grave.

We are told that Aristarchus, of Samos, maintained, two hundred and eighty years before the Christian era, that the earth turned on its own axis and revolved about the sun. The world universally concedes to-day that the philosopher of Samos was right; but his intelligent contemporaries regarded the doctrine as so absurd, as so violent a contradiction of the evidence of their own senses, as so repellant to the teachings of their scientists and the beliefs of their ancestors, that Aristarchus very nearly paid for his theory with his life.

But let us suppose that the Samian philosopher had been driven insane by the persecutions of his senseless fellow-citizens, led, we will say, by his own brother, a priest in one of the heathen temples of Samos; and then suppose that, after some years had passed, the learned Samians had begun to conclude that there might be some truth in the much-abused theory, and that, at least, it deserved serious and candid consideration. Now, let us imagine that at this time a nephew of Aristarchus, perceiving that there was some public curiosity about his distinguished relative, had written a book without one word to say in behalf of the

* Theodore Bacon's "Life of Delia Bacon."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory which had alone made his uncle illustrious, but with much to urge in extenuation of the bigoted priest and his followers, who had persecuted the great man to madness; and you will have a pretty fair parallel for Theodore Bacon's "Life of Delia Bacon."

If Delia Bacon's theory, that William Shakspere was a mere mask for Francis Bacon, is an absurdity and an insane delusion, and if she was, indeed, simply a mad woman, as her brother, Dr. Leonard Bacon, assured her she was, when she conceived and published that theory, we may well ask why her nephew now "drags her frailties from their dread abode," and parades them before the world. Has she any more claim to a biography, in that case, than any other of the unreasonable and unfortunate inhabitants of Bedlam? If she was simply the insane originator of an impossible conception, should not her relatives have spread the mantle of charitable oblivion over her shattered life? Should they not

> "Walk backward, with averted gaze,
> And hide her shame"?

A biography of Delia Bacon can only be justified by a belief in the truth of the theory with which her life is identified. Anything less than that is to stir the dust of the lunatic dead for commercial purposes; it is to exhibit her, straight-jacket and all, to an unsympathetic public, for a pecuniary consideration.

If Delia Bacon was not insane when she framed and uttered that theory, if she was right in her views,—as right as Aristarchus of Samos was in his day,—then she deserves a hundred biographies to be written by tender and loving friends, with reverent eyes and enthusiastic admiration. If she was right, then was she, indeed, the profoundest thinker of her age, with a sweep of thought and depth of penetration a thousand miles beyond the shallow great ones of her generation. If she was right, she deserves to be honored as a martyr to the truth, who stood nobly up in the arena of the world until torn to pieces by the wild beasts of public opinion. There are many now who regard her as the greatest American yet born; they hope to see her biography yet written by some one who loves, honors, and believes in her.

The strangest part of this book is that, while Theodore Bacon describes his aunt's great theory as "ideas or *fancies*, which soon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after *possessed* her," as if he were describing some demoniacal obsession which had hurled the victim upon the ground foaming and writhing, he, nevertheless, recites facts which are enough to shake the belief of any one gifted with a grain of logical capacity, in the commonly-accepted belief. He says:

"To prove from the plays that their author must have been a lawyer, as Lord Campbell did, was far from difficult, and would have been very helpful, if the demonstration had stood alone. True, there was no historical record of Shakspere's ever having seen a law-book, a court-room, or a lawyer's chambers; and there was some trouble in imagining how the play-actor and theatre-manager, who was writing immortal dramas before he was thirty, and died, after voluminous authorship, at fifty-two, could have acquired what Lord Campbell calls 'the familiar, profound, and accurate knowledge he displayed of juridical principles and practice.'"

The reader would naturally suppose that the man who writes this would, by the ordinary operations of the human mind, reach the conclusion that Shakspere did not, therefore, produce the plays which go by his name. For if the real author was unquestionably a lawyer, and if Shakspere was not a lawyer, then it follows, "as the night the day," that Shakspere could not have written the plays; and, therefore, that so much of the writer's aunt's theories as denied Shakspere's authorship was not a maniacal "possession," or (as Dr. Leonard Bacon expressed it) a "delirious fancy," but grave and sober truth. But does Theodore Bacon come to this conclusion? Not at all. He walks up to it, looks over the fence into it, and then shies off from it, in an inconsequential fashion, worthy of the incongruities of Bedlam itself. He continues:

"But when the eminent Dr. Bucknill, not controverting the argument of Lord Campbell, proved as clearly that Shakspere 'had paid an amount of attention to subjects of medical interest scarcely, if at all, inferior to that which has served as the basis' of the proposition that 'he had devoted seven good years of his life to the practice of the law,' he hindered rather than helped to understand the real life of the dramatist. So when another proves that . . . the poet, so well versed was he in warfare, must have served a campaign or two in the Low Countries; another that he must have been a Roman Catholic in religion; while another shows him to have been necessarily a Puritan; another that his prodigious wealth of allusions to and phrases from the then-untranslated Greek and Latin authors proves his broad and deep erudition,—the understanding consents to one demonstration after another, but may possibly be staggered if called to accept them all together."

In other words, this is Theodore Bacon's mode of reasoning: It is demonstrated, he says:

1. That the real author of the plays was a lawyer.
2. William Shakspere was not a lawyer.
3. Therefore, William Shakspere did not write the plays.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So far, so good ; but he goes on :

1. The real author had given great attention to medicine.

2. There is no evidence that William Shakspere had studied that or any other subject.

3. Therefore, the probabilities are that William Shakspere did not write the plays.

Then he goes a step further :

1. The real author knew so much of war that he must have served in the army in the Low Countries.

2. William Shakspere was never, so far as we know, in the Low Countries or in the army.

3. Therefore, William Shakspere could not have written the plays.

Then he advances another step :

1. It is claimed by some that the author of the plays was a Roman Catholic, and by others that he was a Puritan.

2. William Shakspere "died a Catholic," and he could not have been, at the same time, both Catholic and Puritan.

3. It is, therefore, improbable that William Shakspere wrote the plays.

And then he advances still another step :

1. The real author of the plays was a man of immense erudition, familiar with the untranslated Greek and Roman classics.

2. William Shakspere left school at fourteen, with such scraps of learning as the shabby little school at Stratford, with its one teacher, could give him.

3. It is not likely, therefore, that William Shakspere wrote the plays.

So far it is plain sailing, and every syllogism leads directly and positively to the conclusion that William Shakspere did not write the plays. But Theodore Bacon has one more proposition, which forever, in his judgment, closes the argument. He says in effect :

1. We know of no man who possessed all these extraordinary qualifications.

2. We know William Shakspere did not possess them.

3. Therefore, we are "staggered" into the belief, by this accumulated proof, that William Shakspere must have written the plays! Any one of these arguments separately would have destroyed his title ; their united force establishes it !

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Theodore Bacon had not been absolutely devoid of that which men call the reasoning faculty, might he not have wrought out a proposition something like this ?—

1. Francis Bacon, it is conceded, possessed a great intellect, —the greatest that has ever dwelt on this earth.

2. Francis Bacon possessed, according to Macaulay, the poetical faculty; he had "the most exquisitely-constructed intellect that has ever been bestowed on any of the children of men."

3. Francis Bacon possessed the very style of the great poet. Alexander Smith says of him: "He seems to have written his essays with the pen of Shakespeare."

4. Francis Bacon was an accomplished lawyer.

5. Francis Bacon had studied medicine all his life. He had been always, as he himself says, "puddering in physic."

6. He had spent three years in France during a civil war, and he probably passed through the Low Countries on his way to and from Paris; and the scenes of some of the Shakespeare plays are laid in the very portions of France which he is known to have visited.

7. He was learned in all the learning of the ancient world, and his philosophical writings abound with quotations from those very untranslated Greek and Roman writers to whom there are so many allusions in the plays.

8. He took no part in the religious contentions of his time, and was liberal enough to see the "soul of goodness" in all sects; and his real belief, as revealed in his writings, might, therefore, naturally enough, be a matter of question.

9. As the man William Shakspere possessed none of these qualifications, and as we must, therefore, look elsewhere for the author, is it not possible, nay probable, that Francis Bacon may have been the real writer of the plays ?

10. Could not Delia Bacon have considered, at least, the possibility and probability of the truth of such a theory without being charged with "delirious fancies," or the incoherent extravagancies of insanity,—and that, too, by people who had not given one hour to the study of the Shakespeare plays where she had given years ? Should not ignorance have been modest and silent in the presence of such laborious learning ?

But no such mode of reasoning seems to have occurred to Theodore Bacon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The strangest part of his curious work is found in the fact that, while he undoubtedly indorses the course of Dr. Leonard Bacon in assuring Delia that she was insane because she believed that Francis Bacon wrote the Shakespeare plays, he at the same time quotes, without dissent, utterances which show conclusively that it is almost impossible that Shakspere could have written them. He says, page 51:

"But while she [Delia Bacon] was forming such new and helpful friendships as this one, kindly tolerant, if not more, of her great idea, she was finding, as she thought, foes of her own household. A letter to her oldest brother, dated that same month, makes it plain that she had broached her theory to him also; that his grave, cool judgment had refused to entertain it, and that frankly *and with force*, as his nature was, he had so declared, dissuading her from cherishing it, as *a delirious fancy*."

In other words, while Ralph Waldo Emerson, philosopher, scholar, and poet, was writing to Delia Bacon, "I am deeply gratified to observe the power of statement and the adequateness of the problem which this sketch of your argument evinces," her brother, the Rev. Leonard Bacon, whose calling would imply that he had not made the profligate literature of the play-house an especial study, was telling her, "with force," that she was crazy!

And then, this illogical Theodore Bacon says, speaking of Shakspere:

"No word or hint seems ever to have escaped him to show that he cared for, or even owned, the miraculous offspring which had fallen from him, There is no word or syllable in all the world to indicate that the man, whose multifarious learning is the wonder of the third century after him, ever owned a book, or ever saw one, although he brought together and left behind him a fair estate. Nor is there to be found, in all the world, of this profuse and voluminous author, of this bosom-friend of poets, and printers, and actors, so much as the scratch of a pen on paper, except the three signatures upon his Will. . . . Yet, of his less famous contemporaries, there are autograph manuscripts in abundance. Even of his forerunners by centuries there are extant writings infinitely more plenty than the scanty subscriptions to a legal instrument. Petrarch died two centuries and a half, Dante three centuries before him; yet the manuscripts of both abound, while of him who was greater than either, and was almost of our own time, there is nothing but the mean and sordid Will to show that he ever put pen to paper."

Surely this reads as if the man who wrote it did not believe that the signer of that "sordid Will" was the author of the plays. But no,—he had just told us, without a word of dissent or reproach, that Dr. Leonard Bacon had assured his sister, "with his grave, cool judgment," and "with force, as his nature was," that disbelief in the poacher of Stratford as the author of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most profound and learned works known to man, was "a delirious fancy," and, inferentially, in itself evidence of insanity.

Theodore Bacon quotes also a passage from Delia's writings, of the keenest and most incisive kind, touching that problem which must present itself to every thoughtful mind,—to wit: how it comes that the greatest man that ever lived (and surely the author of the plays is to be esteemed such) could have passed through the world without making some impress, however slight, upon the events of his age. If the penetrating thoughts in the following passage grew, as Dr. Leonard Bacon would have us believe, out of insanity, then it would be well if Heaven would inflame the minds of the stupid multitude, the whole Bacon family included, with a universal lunacy of the same kind:

"Surely we have negatives enough already. If he [Shakspere] did not steal the deer, will you tell us what one mortal thing he did do? He wrote the plays. But did the man who wrote the plays do nothing else? Are there not some foregone conclusions in them?—some intimations, and round ones, too, that he who wrote them, be he who he may, has had experiences of some sort? Do such things as these, that the plays are full of, begin in the fingers' ends? Can you find them in an ink-horn? Can you sharpen them out of a goose-quill? . . . Has this man's life been all *play*? Has there been no earnest in it?—no acting in his own name? Has he dealt evermore with second-hand reports, unreal shadows, and mockeries of things? Has there been no personal grapple with realities here? . . . Did not Æschylus fight at Salamis? Did not Scipio teach Terence how to marshal his men and wing his words? And was not Socrates as brave at Potidæa and Delium as he was in the market-place? And did not Cæsar, the author, kill his millions? But this giant wrestler and warrior of ours, with the essence of all the battles of all the ages in his nerves,—with the blood of a new Adam bubbling in his veins,—he cannot be permitted to leap out of those everlasting buskins of his long enough to have a brush with this one live deer, but the critics must have out their spectacles, and be down upon him with their objections."

And how profound and how brilliant is this exegesis, taken like the last, from her *Putnam Magazine* article:

"Condemned to look for the author of Hamlet himself—the subtle Hamlet of the university, the courtly Hamlet, 'the glass of fashion and the mould of form'—in that dirty, doggish group of players, who came into the scene summoned like a pack of hounds to his service, the very tone of his courtesy to them, with its princely condescension, with its arduous formality, only serving to make the great, impassable social gulf between them the more evident,—compelled to look in that ignominous group, with its faithful portraiture of the players of that time (taken from the life by one who had had dealings with them), for the princely scholar himself in his author, how could we understand him,—the enigmatical Hamlet,—with the thoughts of the ages in his foregone conclusions?"

And where have the microscopical wrigglers over the words of the great text,—the entomologists of criticism, who are content to spend their years over a misplaced syllable,—where have any of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them reached into the heart of the mighty mystery, and touched the very soul of the poet, as in these lines?—

"He [the real author] carries the court perfume with him, unconsciously, wherever he goes; among mobs of artisans that will not 'keep their teeth clean'; into the ranks of 'greasy citizens' and 'rude mechanicals'; into country feasts and merry-makings; among 'pretty low-born lasses,' 'the queens of curds and cheese,' and into the heart of that forest 'where there is no clock.' He looks into Arden and into East-cheap from the court stand-point, not from these into the court; and he is as much a prince with Poins and Bardolph as he is when he enters and throws open to us, without awe, without consciousness, the most delicate mysteries of the royal presence."

And where can be found a more magnificent tribute to the genius of the real author of the plays than in the following?—

"The faintly-limned outlines of the nucleus which that name once included are all gone long ago, dissolved in the splendors, dilated into the infinities, which this modern Shakespeare dwells in. It is Shakespeare, *the author*, that we now know only, the author of these worlds of profoundest art, these thought-crowded worlds, which modern reading discovers in these printed pages of his. It is the posthumous Shakespeare of the posthumous volume that we now know only. No, not even that; it is only the work itself that we now know by that name—the phenomenon, and not its beginning. For, with each new study of the printed page, further and further behind it, deeper and deeper into regions where no man so much as undertakes to follow it, retreats the power, which is for us all already, as truly as if we had confessed it to ourselves, the unknown, the unnamed."

And the woman who could write profound criticism in this magnificent style has been set down by the witlings of the civilized world, for thirty-odd years, as a lunatic, who had conceived a theory worthy of the mad-house!

Again, speaking of the man of Stratford, she says, after showing how many illusions of the world's youth had been dissipated:

"Let him alone! We will keep this one mighty conjurer still, even in the place where men most do congregate; and nobody shall stir a hair on his impossible old head, or trouble him with a question. He shall stand there still, pulling interminable splendors out of places where they never could have been; that is the charm of it; he shall stand there rubbing those few sickly play-house manuscripts of his, or a few old, musty play-house novels, and wringing from them the very wine of all our life; showering from their greasy folds the gems and gold of all the ages! He shall stand there, spreading, in the twinkling of an eye, for a single night, in a dirty theatre, 'to complete a purchase that he had a mind to,' the feasts of the immortal gods, and before our lips can, by any chance, have reached even the edge of those cups that open doors into infinity, when the show has served his purpose, he shall whisk it all away again, and leave no wreck behind, except by accident; and none shall remonstrate, or say him 'wherefore?' He shall stand there still, for us all—the magician; nature's one, complete, incontestable, gorgeous triumph over the impossibilities of reason."

Theodore Bacon could copy all this into his book and then, without a word of dissent or reproach, apology or extenuation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could insert also Dr. Leonard Bacon's letter to Delia, written in 1856,—he calls it "a long and most wise, considerate, and affectionate letter,"—in which that profound Shakesperean critic remarks: "You know perfectly well that the great world does not care a sixpence who wrote 'Hamlet'!" And he assures her that her "theory about Shakespeare" is a delusion; that she is in an "enchanted wood,"—in other words, insane already; and that for five years he has thought so; and that she had better publish her work *as a fiction!* He tells her that "some passages" of his letter "were written with the consciousness that they would be painful to her," and he concludes—not by sending her any money to help her in her dire distress, but—by "commending her to the watchfulness and covenant love of the God of our father and mother"!

A cooler specimen of cruel, insolent, hypocritical cold-bloodedness it would be difficult to find. He writes to an over-wrought, under-fed, under-clothed, unhappy woman, to whom he has rendered little or no pecuniary assistance during her five years' absence in England, assuring her that she is crazy, and has been any time during all those five years, and advising her to turn the fruits of her laborious studies, her magnificent penetration, her subtle critical analysis, into a romance,—an amusing story-book! No wonder poor Delia refused to answer that letter, and writes to Hawthorne:

"I have suffered, past the power of tongue or pen to say how much, from his harshness and coldness and desertion of me, but I have always apologized for him. . . . But I do not think there *is* any healing for this. . . . He knows how to express himself according to the prescribed rules of Christian kindness, when he is most cruel. This is a very fraternal letter on the surface. . . . It is necessary that you should know what fatal misunderstanding it is that separates me from my natural helpers. . . . I have never written to them for any aid. I would have died first."

Here is a brother who has done almost nothing for his sister for five years,—he appears to have sent her fifty dollars during that time!—she has struggled with the most wretched poverty in order to finish her work and publish her book; she has lived in rags, on the charity of strangers, enduring unheard-of hardships; and at last he writes her a letter assuring her, in the most sanctimonious manner, that she is crazy!

Mrs. Farrar says:

"She had suffered many privations during the time that she was writing her book. She lived on the poorest food, and was often without the means of having a fire in her chamber. She told me that she wrote a great part of her large octavo volume sitting up in bed, in order to keep warm."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We need not ask the question whether any gentleman, even though he be forty times a brother, is justified in writing to a woman whom he has abandoned and deserted for five years,—a high-strung, intellectual, over-worked woman, just finishing a tremendous literary task,—telling her with brutal frankness that she is a lunatic, and commending her to "the watchfulness and covenant love of God," while he does not send her a penny. But let us inquire whether Delia Bacon was insane at the time her brother wrote this letter. Not at all, and he knew it, for, only a month before, Hawthorne had written him:

"However mistaken your sister may be, she has produced a most remarkable work, written with wonderful earnestness and ability, and full of very profound criticism. Its merits are entirely independent of the truth of her theory. I am in hopes to find a publisher for the work, here in England, and I should judge that there was a fair chance of its meeting with such success as would render her independent of her friends. . . . At the only interview which I have had with Miss Bacon, I found her tolerably well in bodily health, perfectly cheerful, and conversing with great power and intelligence."

And not content to put into the mind of the poor woman the poison of the suspicion of her own sanity, to work like the mines of sulphur, he writes to Hawthorne, who is trying to procure a publisher for her book, that his protégée is insane! He says:

"She knows that since 1851 I have habitually distrusted the soundness of her judgment. She knows that I have, all along, regarded her darling theory as a mere hallucination. She, therefore, distrusts me."

If this man had helped Delia Bacon to cross the ocean to London, if he had supported her there with money and kind words during all those years of struggle, he would not have been justified to step between her and the kind friend who was laboring to find her a publisher. But for one who had done almost nothing for her while she was toiling, starving, and freezing in London, thus to stab her in the back, in the name of God, and seek to bring her life-labors to naught, would have been villanous in any man, and was doubly damnable in a brother and a minister of Christ. Even Theodore Bacon admits that she was sane until some time after she had finished and published her book. He says (page 301): "Before this time [1856] in all that she wrote or did there was nothing to mark a disordered intellect, *unless her disbelief in the accepted authorship of the plays was itself proof of insanity*"! Speaking, in a letter to Hawthorne, written after she received her brother's cruel epistle, Delia Bacon says:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I had no heart to go on till I received the second [letter from Hawthorne], after that *assault upon my reason*. I knew what fearful risk I was incurring, what my own brother was prepared to say of me in case I failed, as I expected to, for I began to take part against myself—*it was enough to drive one mad.*"

How like a luminous star in all this horrible darkness shines out the beautiful kindliness of Nathaniel Hawthorne! In this ragged, poverty-stricken, deserted woman, who was driven by her sharp necessities even to beg him for money, he saw a great, suffering genius. His patience, his goodness, his kindness, his charity, were inexhaustible. When her pride restrained her from asking him for help, he thrust it upon her, but with such courtesy and tenderness as to rob the gift of its sting. Here is the postscript to one of his letters, written September 24, 1856:

"You say nothing about the state of your funds. Pardon me for alluding to the subject; but you promised to apply to me in case of need. I am ready."

And even towards the last, when unreasoning irritability foreshadowed the disintegration of the nerve-fibre and the overthrow of that sovereign intellect, he was as kind, as gentle, as forbearing as a mother with her sick child. May his memory be forever loved and honored, in the annals of this our country, for his goodness to Delia Bacon!

Poor lady! Her life closed in the blackest darkness. The last sounds that rang in her ears, as sense and memory left them, were the denunciations of the American critics. In her dementia she could scarcely have conjured up beings more cruel and hideous and utterly abominable than that howling, senseless, ribald crew. Hawthorne says:

"If any American ever wrote a word in her behalf, Miss Bacon never knew it, nor did I. Our journalists at once republished some of the most brutal vituperations of the English press, thus pelting their poor countrywoman with stolen mud, without even waiting to know whether the ignominy was deserved. And they never have known it to this day and never will."

Hawthorne says that "it has been the fate of this remarkable book never to have had more than a single reader"; but that reader, we are glad to say, is one of the clearest brains and most chivalric souls in America,—Mr. William D. O'Connor, of the Life-Saving Service, Washington, author of "Hamlet's Note-Book."

Did Delia Bacon's work deserve to drop thus like a plummet into the depths of a shameful oblivion? Did it deserve to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trampled under foot, unread, by the shrieking, howling, jeering mob of Calibans who called themselves critics? No; a thousand times no! Ralph Waldo Emerson said of it: "I have seen nothing in the United States in the way of literary criticism which I think half so good." And he was so moved by the force of the argument that, while fearing to follow it, as a convert and martyr, to its legitimate conclusion, he, nevertheless, put forth such oracular and significant utterances as this:

"The Egyptian verdict of the Shakesperean societies comes to mind, that he was a jovial actor and manager. I cannot marry this fact to his verse. Other admirable men have led lives in some sort of keeping with their thought; but this man in wide contrast. . . . Read the antique documents extricated, analyzed, and compared by the assiduous Dyce and Collier; and now read one of those skiey sentences—aërolites—which seem to have fallen out of heaven, . . . and tell me if they match."

That able and kindly and intellectual woman, Mrs. Hawthorne, wrote Delia Bacon, August 3, 1856:

"I feel so ignorant in the presence of your extraordinary learning, that it seems absurd in me even to say what I think of your manuscripts, and yet I cannot help it, for I never read so profound and wonderful a criticism, and I think there never was such a philosophic insight and appreciation since Lord Bacon himself. . . They are wonderful, magnificent."

And these were the manuscripts of that book which has had but one reader and a thousand brutal assailants in America!

Has not the time come for the New World to revise the prejudiced judgments of intolerant and unprogressive England? Are we anything yet but provincials—colonists? Had we not better throw overboard, not the tea, but the teachings of English opinion, drown them in Boston harbor, and frame a new declaration of intellectual independence? Have we upon ourselves the congenital marks of native and natural inferiority, that we must ask another race, beneath us in culture, civilization, numbers, and wealth, to do our thinking for us?

Let us begin the great revolution by striving to lift up the memory of poor, unhappy, heroic, gifted Delia Bacon. We slaughtered her to please English bigotry. Should we not now do justice to her, that we may begin to do justice to ourselves?

IGNATIUS DONNELLY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEGISLATIVE INJUSTICE TO RAILWAYS.

BY HENRY CLEWS.

THE chief trouble about the railroad legislation that we have hitherto had has been its demagogic character. The railroads represent, more than anything else, the fabulously-rich capitalists of this country. Every railroad company, in fact, is a combination of capitalists, and to every legislative body an object of popular attack because of the approbation of the large majority of voters who are comparatively poor. The incentive is very strong, therefore, on the part of so-called statesmen in State politics, to ingratiate themselves with the many by the advocacy of measures which appeal most strongly and directly to popular prejudices. The theory with people in general who think anything about railroad affairs, but who do not make a special or a scientific study of the subject, is that rates for passengers and freights should be kept within a range so as to return only enough for fixed charges and fair interest on bonds. They are taught to believe that the stocks of all the railroad companies were never paid for by the wealthy original owners, that the railroads have been built with the proceeds of the bonds, and that the stock is nothing but water. Hence they conclude that the earnings should not return more than four to five per cent. on the actual capital invested. They contend that the legislation by which the companies received their charters was largely obtained by unfair or fraudulent means.

It is presumed, however, that legislatures have been reformed since most of the charters now in existence were acquired, and for this reason the present trustworthy representatives are disposed to take away what was improperly granted by their predecessors. A fair sample of this species of legislative reform and injustice has taken place in Iowa of late, and its execution is grinding down some of the Western properties to a non-dividend

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

level, which may ultimately throw the railroads subject to it into the hands of receivers. Some people carp at the legal decisions enforcing the law in these cases, as in the recent rulings of Judge Brewer. This, of course, arises both from ignorance of the law and from want of capacity to distinguish accurately between the law itself and the declaration of its execution. There are no grounds for the inference that Judge Brewer's decisions have been in any degree strained to favor the Granger element. I believe his exposition of the law will be found in accordance with the spirit of the legislation, if tested by the interpretation of the highest tribunal. It is, therefore, beside the question, and merely juggling with words and phrases, to talk of error of judgment on the part of the court in this case. It may satisfy people who are hurt, to have a tangible object like Judge Brewer, upon whom they can vent their wrath, since an intangible object, like a defunct legislature, cannot be attacked,—it is like trying to clutch the ghostly dagger in the play.

What is, then, to be done? There is no evidence except the presumption of present legislators themselves that they are any better morally or more irreproachable or unapproachable than when Commodore Vanderbilt said he found it cheaper to buy a legislature, or the majority thereof, than to elect it. It is also on record that another great railroad magnate has testified that the stripe of politics which might happen to constitute the majority in one of those honorable bodies, did not appreciably affect the price necessary to purchase its vote in the interest of any great corporation. Thus it seems to have been demonstrated that politicians have more virtue before than after election. It might, therefore, be legitimately inferred that the less money used in elections the better the chance of electing men who would really represent the masses; and, also, that the masses are harder to corrupt than their representatives chosen by the system in which money is used either directly or indirectly. So it appears that a change in the methods of State elections, at least, must precede any legislation not tainted with injustice at its very fountain-head. And this applies not only to railroad measures, but to all public measures.

These reflections, however, are going deeper into the question which must be met sooner or later, than I had at first intended. The great and prominent injustice in State railroad legislation is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of geographical necessity, owing to the nature of inter-State commerce. Hence one State forcibly, though indirectly, legislates for another. This is unconstitutional.

The only remedy for this evil seems to be in Congressional legislation, as the conflict and discord of State laws on the subject only appear to lead to greater confusion with every additional enactment, and there is no possibility, that I can see, of harmonizing them by any kind of arbitration. The variety is too large and the interests involved too diverse to expect any satisfactory consummation of this kind. National legislation, therefore, is the only remedy. A higher power than State legislation furnishes is required to deal with the great railroad problem. The Inter-State-Commerce Act is a fair experiment in this direction, and although it requires modifications to bring it into greater harmony with the principles of equity, yet its practical outcome has far exceeded what was generally expected of it in good results, and the mountains of evil predicted for the experiment of its execution have generally diminished to the compass of ordinary hills, at least—if not mole-hills. With certain modifications in the anti-pooling clause and in the long- and short-haul clause, the act can be made to meet the ends of justice to the railroads, the farmers, and the interests of commerce better than all the enactments of both State and National legislatures of the past. With these clauses remaining intact, and the consequent free competition, many weak roads that have now reached a paying basis, with a fair share of traffic, must go into the hands of receivers.

It is easy to see, by a little reflection, the result to which this would lead. It would cause an era of consolidations, and subsequently put the whole railroad system into the hands of a few wealthy corporations, with a fair ultimate prospect of centralization, or into a few mammoth trusts for the whole country, that could make rates according to their arbitrary will. The telegraph service may be said to be already there; and why can the railroad system not "get there all the same"? It seems to be generally accepted that the Inter-State Act must stand. No person who has reflected on the circumstances of its enactment, and the careful deliberation connected therewith, can entertain the idea that there is any probability of its repeal in the near future. The railroad managers have accepted, with good grace, the situation imposed by the law, thereby showing that they are good, conservative citi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zens, and are not disposed to quarrel with the inevitable. But they are keenly alive to the hardships involved in the practical working of the clauses referred to, and, while wishing to preserve the act in its entirety, they would like to see those clauses so modified as to remove the pressure.

Nothing would seem fairer to the ordinary reasoning mind than that to the railroad companies themselves should be accorded the power and the liberty of making an equitable division of traffic revenue. This is, virtually, what the fifth section (called the anti-pooling clause) of the Inter-State Act prohibits, stated in the simplest form. It seems, at first blush, unreasonable and unjust to legislate against such a seemingly fair agreement. In fact, it appears to be a harsh interference with the freedom of the citizen to enter into a contract. But a study of the history of pooling arrangements exhibits the matter in a different light. These agreements, with few, if any, exceptions, have been of the nature of that proverbial pie-crust which was made to be broken. They have all been broken. They have been of the nature of a law without a sanction. There has been no adequate penalty to enforce the fulfilment of the agreement, which degenerated into a mere farce to those who understood it, and became a delusion and a snare to the few who were simple enough to regard it seriously. So, when looked at in the light of these historic events, the anti-pooling clause, after all, is not much of an injustice. It simply prohibited the periodical farce of the managers' meetings at Commissioner Fink's office—which Mr. Fink himself euphoniously termed "love-feasts."

A clause that would afford every railroad not built for ulterior purposes, like the West Shore, Nickel Plate, and certain others, a chance to get a fair and living share of traffic, or that would provide a modified pooling system enforced by a large enough penalty to insure specific performance, would probably make the Inter-State Law generally acceptable to all parties affected by its execution. The recent meeting of railroad managers at Mr. Pierpont Morgan's residence proved that the controlling spirit of the railroads has been brought into harmony with the main features of the Inter-State Law, although the railroad managers were strongly opposed to it, when it was enacted. This shows that there is nothing like practical experience to test the wisdom of a law. The best theories, in this instance, have proved signal failures.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One great difficulty that present railroad legislators have to contend with is the evil methods of railroad building and extension. A great deal of the mileage of the last two years has been premature, and doubtless for speculative purposes. Most of it has been constructed, however, by old companies who had good credit to float bonds and could raise all the money required. Hence there has been but little financial embarrassment arising from the too rapid construction. But people are beginning to find out that a great deal of this building has been in the interest of speculative directors and their friends, who, for a mere song, had bought up barren lands, considered worthless because there was no means of transportation. But these lands soon become immensely valuable for sites of villages, towns, and cities. The construction companies by which these roads were generally built, raised the cost to the highest possible figures, in order, I fear, to make dividends for the construction stockholders. It is noteworthy that the directors connected with these construction schemes have been exceedingly prosperous, while the stockholders of the roads have grown poor in an inverse ratio. The dividends of the latter have disappeared. The new mileage for the past year, much of which, I apprehend, has been made on this principle, was about twenty-one thousand miles, which is greater than the entire mileage of Great Britain. There should be additions to the Inter-State Law, or a special law regulating the methods of construction companies, which are probably doing more to demoralize the railroad system—and doing it very insidiously, too—than any other factor connected with these great arteries of the country's prosperity.

Legislative reform is greatly needed in the matter of railroad reports, especially for the safety of investors, and to prevent speculative abuses among railroad officials and their friends and favorites. There should be statements issued annually, or perhaps more frequently, upon the truth of which everybody might rely. These should be sworn statements, and should bear the signatures of at least three of the directors. These directors should be required to call to their aid expert accountants, and should have placed at their disposal all the books of the company or corporation and all the other papers necessary to verify the accuracy of their report. The correctness of the statement, when issued, would then be a foregone conclusion, and an investor in London, Paris, or Berlin could buy or sell on his own judgment,—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an experiment which, under existing arrangements, might prove very costly. It is proverbial that a railroad statement now is defective in the most essential particulars, and, to put it mildly, usually covers a multitude of sins. According to one plan approved by railroad companies, the statement published to-day, for instance, is made to show a surplus of many millions, but there is nothing said about an open construction account to which the surplus is debtor. On this favorable showing (with this *suppressio veri*) the stock goes up and the insiders quickly unload upon the investment public. The following statement, which comes out six months later, shows that the surplus has been used to settle the construction indebtedness. The surplus has disappeared; consequently the stock suffers a serious decline. Those who bought on the strength of the large surplus sell out, on being informed of its distribution. Then the inside sharks come forward again and purchase at reduced prices, probably at a depreciation of from ten to fifteen points or more, and keep their stock until the next periodical appearance of the bogus surplus. Thus the insiders grow rich, while the outsiders become poor. The only remedy for this abuse is a sworn statement at regular intervals, and if the directors should commit perjury, they would render themselves liable to state-prison: if a few of them should be tempted to fall into the trap, and be made examples of in this way, nothing would do more to work a speedy reform in this contemptible method of book-keeping.

I would also suggest a change in the character of the directors. Those usually chosen for this office now are men who have vast interests of their own, more than sufficient to absorb their entire time and thoughts. They are selected mainly, on account of their high-sounding names, to give tone to the corporation and solidify its credit, in order that the lambs of speculation may have proper objects in whom confidence can be reposed and no questions asked. The management of the affairs of the corporation is frequently intrusted to one man, who runs the business to suit his own individual interests.

I would also suggest that chairs be instituted in several of our colleges, to be filled by professors who have passed through all the principal departments of a railroad-office experience. And in addition they should be possessed of a good literary and scientific education. These general experts in railroad matters should have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in charge the education of young men, and award diplomas to them as Expert Railroad Directors. Then I would make it incumbent upon every railroad company to have one or more of these graduates in every directory, at a salary, say, equal to that of a Senator or Member of Congress. Every such director should know thoroughly all there is to know about railroad book-keeping, railroad building, and railroad management generally. His position should be raised to the dignity of a profession, and his diploma awarded only on the most searching examination of his qualifications for the office. The position should be made as desirable and attractive as that of any of the learned professions; capability and character being the principal tests of fitness for the selection to any vacancy.

There should also be public accountants, who have passed through the same course and discipline, to be called upon to examine the books of every corporation at the making up of any report for publication. To these reports their official signatures should be attached. All official delinquencies could then be met with condign punishment and perpetual disgrace, so that all but those who have the strictest confidence in their own integrity would be deterred from seeking the office. The principal idea would be to make the offices I suggest such that the honor, rather than the emoluments, would attract eligible incumbents. Students passing through such a collegiate course as this might also be required, as a means of greater practical efficiency, to go through a practical course of a year or two in a railroad office, with frequent opportunities of going over and examining the road, as well as making trips of inspection over all the trunk lines, for special information and instruction.

Thus equipped, directors and accountants would be qualified authorities upon whose judgment the public could rely. I think the experiment might be appropriately commenced in Columbia College, Leland Stanford's new university, and Vanderbilt University.

To return, however, to the strictly legislative aspect of this question, it would seem that State railroad legislation is doomed to unpopularity, as recently indicated in the rejection of the bill reducing tariffs by the Nebraska Senate, and the rumored intention of the Iowa Commissioners to favor a higher schedule. As I have intimated above, therefore, a comprehensive measure by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress is needed, which would form a kind of digest, briefly embracing anything that might be good in the present State laws and rejecting the rest.

In framing such a measure, it would be judicious for Congress to avail itself of the advice of some of our best jurists, in addition to those of its own body—such, for instance, as the two Fields, Cooley, Evarts, Noah Davis, and others. Then we might have a railroad measure that would compare, in point of wisdom, with some of the best parts of the Code Napoleon or the code of Louisiana.

HENRY CLEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMMON-SENSE AND COPYRIGHTS.

BY THE HON. GEORGE S. BOUTWELL.

If the voice of the recognized organs of public sentiment is accepted as a fair expression of the opinions of the American people, there is in this country a general judgment in favor of a system of international copyright. It is probable, however, that the American people have not so considered the subject as to be qualified to form an opinion, and they may never form an opinion until the system is tested by experience. The people, as a whole, may have a large interest in the question, but, with the exception of authors and publishers, the individual interests are too slight and too remote to create and crystallize a public sentiment. The authors and publishers, supported by a large body of influential citizens, are active in aid of the policy. As a result, or as a coincident circumstance, the literature of Great Britain and the United States is controlled by the friends of the proposed measure. This array has existed, in fact, if not in form, for many years, and yet the progress of the undertaking has been only moderate.

The opposition, for the most part, has been voluntary, individual, and unsystematic. The difficulties in the way of the movement and the delays that have occurred have not been due, in any appreciable degree, to the manifestations of doubt and hostility that have been so made, but rather to a notion, which is quite general in the public mind, that the adoption of the system will inaugurate an era of comparatively expensive literature for America. Their process of reasoning may be erroneous, but it is simple and direct. If English authors are to be benefited under the proposed system by the sale of their writings in the United States, then the purchasers and readers of English books must pay something additional for the privilege of owning and reading reprints of English works.

And if there is error in this view of the subject, it is difficult

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to say wherein it consists. If the English author is to receive a royalty under the proposed system, while now he receives nothing, then, beyond dispute, somebody must pay. The necessity falls upon the publisher. He must pay or he cannot print. Will he bear the burden or will he transfer it to the purchaser? If to the purchaser, then every public library, every private collection, every casual reader of a foreign book, will be compelled to share in the contribution.

If, then, this reasoning be free from error, it follows that the proposed copyright system contemplates a scheme of taxation of the American people, indirect to be sure, and not universal or equal, but yet a legalized system whose benefits inure primarily and chiefly, if not exclusively, to persons who are not citizens of the United States. Such a scheme can be defended only upon the ground of justice or national expediency.

On the ground of justice it is claimed that an author has a property in the thought which he has chosen, combined with the form in which he has seen fit to express the thought, and that it is a crime for another person to reproduce that thought in that particular form. If this be not so, then the adoption of the scheme cannot be demanded upon the ground of its justice. This claim of property in the thought, combined with the form of expression, is to be distinguished from the material,—that is, from the book or pamphlet in which the thought is expressed. The book is property and the law protects it, but the real question remains; which is this: When the author has sold the book and received payment therefor, is it a crime in the purchaser to reproduce that book?

For the purposes of government, crimes are of two sorts, and it seems not to be within the province of ethical inquiry to change or to modify the arrangement. First, certain acts are criminal in their very nature. Such are murder, burglary, highway robbery, and a long catalogue of acts whose criminal character is recognized by all civilized and by many savage peoples. Can it be maintained that the reprinting of a book which one has purchased and paid for, is a crime *per se?* that it is to be classed with burglary and highway robbery?

The manifest answer to these questions is that it has never been so classed, and that the sentiments and the judgment of mankind would revolt at such a classification.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secondly, certain acts are made crimes by law. Such, for example, is smuggling. In the nature of things, it is not a crime to carry goods from one country to another country. The act has no moral quality in it. Considered in itself, it is neither good nor bad. When, however, the law prohibits or regulates the importation of goods, then a violation of the law becomes a crime, and the offender will be treated as a criminal.

If the reprinting of a foreign book is not a crime in the nature of things, or, as the law terms it, is not a crime *per se*, and if such reprinting be not a crime by statute, then there is no foundation for the claim that it is a crime to reproduce a foreign book in the United States; consequently the injustice of reprinting a foreign book is not in the criminal nature of the act.

But it may be claimed that there is a right of property in a thought when expressed in a certain form, although the reproduction of that thought in the same form is not a crime. In reply, it is to be said that the right of property, if such right exists, is not in the circumstance that the expression of the thought is presented in a printed book. The right, if it exist at all, must inhere in the spoken word as surely as in the written or printed paragraph.

The fact that an author has employed a stenographer to write, or a compositor and printer to print, the expression of his thought, gives to him a property in the manuscript or book, but he thereby acquires no right of property in the thought so expressed that he would not have had in the thought expressed in the same form at a dinner-table conversation. In the nature of things, and without the intervention and aid of the law, a thought expressed, and however expressed, whether in conversation, or by open writing, or by public printing, is thereby dedicated to the public. A thought unexpressed is a possession, but it is not property, and when it has been uttered it is neither a possession nor property.

The Constitution of the United States, in the provision relating to authors and inventors, proceeds upon the idea that authors and inventors have no right of property in their writings or inventions, independent of the particular book or device in which the thought is expressed. The phrase is this: "The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there were a right of property in expressed thought, then there was a corresponding duty resting upon the Government to protect that right, not for a limited period of time, but perpetually. In pursuance of that provision of the Constitution, inventors are secured in their inventions for the term of seventeen years, and authors for the term of twenty-eight years, with the privilege of an extension for fourteen years. If authors and inventors have a right of property, as claimed, then, by the Constitution and laws, their property has been appropriated to the public for all time in excess of the specified times, and that without compensation. If the opinion of the framers of the Constitution is of any value, the reason assigned for the provision is a refutation of the claim of right of property in thought expressed. The authority was granted to Congress as a means of promoting "the progress of science and useful arts." The monopoly given to writers and inventors is thus justified on grounds of public policy, and without the least reference to property rights.

Upon this view of the subject it is claimed that authors have no right of property in a thought, however expressed, independent of the material form in which the expression is uttered, and, consequently, that the reproduction of the language in which the thought is expressed is free of criminal taint. And it follows, further, that whatever rights of property authors and inventors have enjoyed, were rights created by the law upon grounds of National policy and subject at all times to the will of the Government, and this without any violation of private rights or neglect of public duty.

If it may now be assumed that the international-copyright system cannot be vindicated upon the ground of justice to authors and writers, the single question remains: Is it expedient for the Government and people of the United States to adopt the system?

Practically, the question is important chiefly in connection with Great Britain and its dependencies. The publication of a foreign book in another language is an unusual occurrence in the United States, and a translation made by a citizen is entitled to the benefits of the copyright system. As between Great Britain and the United States there is great inequality. The population of the United States is in the ratio of twelve to seven, when compared with the population of Great Britain, and in proportion to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population we would furnish two readers of an English book as often as Great Britain would furnish one reader of an American book. The ratio of readers would be as twenty-four to seven. The fact may not be creditable to us as a literary people, but it is probable that the number of English books copyrighted in America would be three times as great as the number of American books that would be copyrighted in England.

Thus it must happen that England would contribute only a moderate amount to the support of American authors, while the United States would contribute at least three times as much to English authors. If, therefore, we were prepared to coöperate with Great Britain in a system of protection to the authors of the two countries, we ought to consider whether the advantages are to be equal. Can we afford to pay three dollars to English authors and writers in order that American authors may receive one dollar from the reading public of Great Britain?

All this assumes that the price of English books will be increased in the United States, and that the price of American books will be advanced in Great Britain; and if this assumption be not just, we may well inquire by what means are the authors of either country to be benefited by an international-copyright system. If we apply the logic of trade to the case, we are justified in the conclusion that the prices of English reprints would correspond to the prices of American books, while at the present time they are sold at much lower rates. The competition thus existing affects the price of American books, and always in favor of the public.

It is claimed that an international-copyright system will encourage writing in America, and especially that young and unknown authors will be benefited.

Should this prediction prove true as to America, must not English writers enjoy a greater advantage, inasmuch as the American market is a more profitable field for them than is the English market for us? But it is an error to assume that unknown authors suffer most largely from the reprint of English books in the United States. The reprints are of standard works, usually, and the competition is chiefly with our best writers. In truth, however, the competition is less in books than in any other department of trade, inasmuch as the writings of one author can never be accepted as the equivalent of the writings of another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The presence of many books on the market tends to an increase of sales, and the sale of good books at low prices adds yearly to the number of persons who will buy other good books at higher prices.

If we divide American authors into two classes, it will appear that one class does not need the benefits of an international-copyright system, and that the other class could not participate in those benefits. First, those American authors whose writings would be reprinted and read in Great Britain are, generally, amply compensated by the monopoly of the American market. Secondly, it may be said of the majority of American writers, that their works could not be sold in Great Britain, and, therefore, to all such, the monopoly of that market could have no value. To the latter class some benefits might arise from the exclusion of English works which are now sold at low prices and interfere to some extent in the sale of American low-priced literature. But at the end, if the element of justice be eliminated from the claim of American authors, none but the most important reasons can warrant the government of the United States in the adoption of a system which will limit the opportunity of the great body of the American people to read and to enjoy the choice literature of England.

In this I assume that an English author has no claim upon us on the ground of justice, and that he is not a proper subject for the exercise of the spirit of benevolence. All this rests upon a principle of action that is daily recognized by nations and by individuals. If one nation makes an improvement in naval architecture or gunnery, is it thought improper for another nation to follow the example ?

But it is said that manufacturers are protected, that sea-coast commerce is protected, and, above all, that inventors are protected by an international system, and that equal reasons exist for the protection of authors. An examination of this claim may show that it does not rest upon any principle or rule of protection that has been recognized in the policy of the United States. The coast commerce is protected by the exclusion of foreigners, but it is open to the free competition of American citizens. The features of a monopoly cannot be found in the system, and its benefits inure exclusively to our own people. The laws in regard to the coasting trade exclude foreigners from its benefits, while the pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posed international-copyright system gives to a foreigner a monopoly of the American market. We deny to foreign-built ships the privilege of an American register, but the business of building ships in the United States is open to every citizen. These laws rest upon the theory that we exclude the outer world for the purpose of protecting and encouraging the genius and industry of our own people. The international-copyright system may give encouragement to the genius and industry of American citizens, but it will give also equal encouragement to the genius and industry of the subjects of England.

The basis of the system of protection to domestic industry appears to be this: that as a matter of public policy it is wise to impose a duty upon an article of foreign production which shall diminish or prohibit the importation of that article, and with the expectation that, after a time for experience, the article can be produced in the United States at the cost, substantially, of the foreign product. It is the purpose of the system to exclude the foreign product from our markets, or to limit the importation, while the effect of the international-copyright system is to give to the foreign author a monopoly of the American market in the particular article that he produces. The American manufacturer, although protected against foreign competition, is, nevertheless, exposed to constant and active domestic competition.

The chief argument from analogy is drawn from the policy of the Government in regard to inventions, which, as is claimed, are entitled to no more consideration than writings. At first view, this claim seems to be well founded, but an examination of the subject cannot fail to destroy the argument from analogy.

It was the early policy of the Government to grant patents to foreign inventors; and within the last three years the United States has become a party to the Industrial Convention, which is an open alliance, and now comprises about fifteen of the most important states of both continents. By the terms of the convention, a patent granted in one state is protected in all. This arrangement rests upon a reason, or rather upon a business fact, which places the wisdom of the policy outside of the region of debate. A patent granted in the United States would be of but little value to the patentee, if persons in Great Britain, France, and Belgium could make the patented article without the payment of a royalty, and then export the device or manufacture to the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and offer it for sale in competition with the same article on which a royalty had been paid to the inventor by the American manufacturer. And if the Government should impose a prohibitory duty upon the patented article, the rest of the world would still be open to foreigners, while the American manufacturers would be excluded from its markets.

It is thus apparent that there can be no monopoly of a patented article in one country unless there is, at the same time, a like monopoly in all countries having commercial intercourse with each other. We may imagine a like condition of affairs in regard to American books, but, as a fact, a like condition never did exist, and there is not the slightest probability that it can ever exist. And, thus, I claim that the advocates of an international-copyright system are not supported in their arguments by the policy of protection as it has been developed in this country, whether with reference to coast-wise trade, or to ship-building, or to protective duties levied on foreign products, or to the international system of protection to patented inventions.

Next to a system of public instruction, this country is most largely interested in the publication of valuable reading matter, and at a moderate cost. If the foreign author cannot claim protection in this country upon the ground of justice, and if it is inexpedient for us to concede protection as a public policy, there is no sufficient reason remaining for the adoption of the international-copyright system. The reading public in America is a large one, and it is increasing in a ratio far greater than the increase of population. That public can never be less in numbers, or less capable of purchasing books, than it is now is. Authors are protected and supported by a body of readers not less than twenty millions strong. Their condition is as satisfactory and their prospects are as promising as are the condition and prospects of any other class of American citizens.

GEO. S. BOUTWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AT THE GOETHE SOCIETY.

BY DION BOUCICAULT.

THE Goethe Society is a club formed by a number of literary and artistic ladies and gentlemen who meet monthly. A suitable hall is hired for each occasion, and some man of letters is invited to address the meeting on a subject with which his name is prominently associated. A dainty supper is provided as an after-piece for members, who, taking their refreshment in informal groups, discuss leisurely the argument of the evening. It is a charming *conversazione panachée*, as the French might call it, and brings together many high spirits in the lightest form.

I was asked to address one of these meetings, and, being allowed to select the subject, proposed "The Influence of the Newspaper Press upon Art."

A distinguished American journalist was invited to make the evening lively by assuming the opposite side of the question and hanging up his shield in this polemical encounter, wherein he defended the virtue of the tenth Muse, which I undertook to question. The president, Mr. Parke Godwin, having "let us go," I took the stand, set my pen in rest, and commenced with a brief history of the brief life of the "Newspaper Press."

It came into existence about one hundred and fifty years ago; its infancy covered the last century up to 1789, when it rapidly developed into manhood, which it reached about seventy years since, when it assumed the proportions, it very justly claimed, of a fourth estate in the organization of mankind. Previous to 1789, journals of news were insignificent affairs, not bigger than handbills, containing political scandals and squibs, peddling small news; while the more important matters were dealt with in periodicals, pamphlets, and magazines. Such were the *Spectator*, the *Craftsman*, the *Idler*, the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the *London*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Magazine, and others. But the public appetite for *news*, which the journals contained, soon gave these sheets a particular influence. We find, in 1740, Mr. Danvers complaining that

> "The people of Great Britain are governed by a power that was never heard of before as a supreme authority in any age or country. It is the government of the *newspaper press*. The stuff which our weekly newspapers are filled with is received with greater reverence than acts of Parliament, and the sentiments of one of these scribblers have more weight with the multitude than the opinions of the best politician in the kingdom."

Let it be borne in mind that the political and social satires of Addison and Steele, the "Drapier's Letters" of Swift, and the utterances of Bolingbroke, Defoe, and others, had been recognized as legitimate and powerful literary agents; wherefore the above remarks were evidently directed at the "newspaper press" of the period.

Twenty years later, Dr. Johnson is more precise. He writes: "Not many years ago the nation was content with one gazette, but now in the metropolis we have our morning and evening journals, and every large town has its weekly historian." We are justified in concluding, therefore, that the newspaper press, as we employ the term, came into the world at the commencement of the last century.

And here, before going further, let us agree on a definition, that we may not fall into vain discussion over terms. The newspaper press is the daily history of the world and record of the doings of mankind, political, commercial, social, artistic, accompanied by editorial comments on the subjects of passing interest. It is a vehicle for intercourse, whereby the wants of the community are interchanged by way of advertisement. These seem to be the essential things which constitute a newspaper, which contains, therefore, principally *news*. The editorial part, consisting of *opinions*, is, or should be, subsidiary, and should not, perhaps, be properly included amongst the essentials. That this part is disregarded by the public has been frequently and clearly shown, and never more clearly than during the recent Presidential election. The news conveyed by the daily press was faithfully accepted and acted upon, while the united editorial influence of the New York press, with comparatively few exceptions, failed to effect the object in view, and Mr. Cleveland was defeated in his own State. The weekly journals are not newspapers, but belong to the tribe

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of pamphlets, essays, periodicals, and magazines. Such were the *Spectator*, the *Craftsman*, the *Idler*, of the last century, which were composed of leading articles; but the so-called newspapers of that period were such puny affairs that their names survive only in the obscurest corners of our recollection. It may be a question whether a simple sheet of pure news, unadulterated with opinions, would not be welcomed by the greater number of readers, who have little time to wade through the bulky mass that encumbers our attention and interferes with an easy digestion.

It may appear unnecessary to observe that the newspaper could not have existed before the invention of printing. But the Goethe Society accepted very gravely the assurance, impressively uttered by my opponent in the discussion, that newspapers had existed throughout a period of *two thousand five hundred years!* I met this astounding assertion with an appropriate wink, but received no acknowledgement in kind. So I set myself to consider who were the readers of such journals during the middle ages, when amongst the people very few knew how to read,—who were the writers when the clergy enjoyed the monopoly of that accomplishment. Public notices, hand-written, containing certain news, and stuck up in open places by the Government, are not newspapers, the very life of which depends on circulation. They are simply placards, and doubtless were used in Greece, in Egypt, and in Rome, and, for all we know, in Nineveh and in Babylon.

Tracing back to its infancy, it seems very likely that our present journal was the direct outcome of the revolutionary spirit that became manifest in the English revolutions of the seventeenth century, and the American and French revolutions of the eighteenth. Cromwell carried a printing-press at the heels of his army, so that he might keep the people informed of his movements and his progress. Immediately after the popular uprising that lifted James from the throne, the pamphlet press appeared, with Addison, Steele, Swift, Bolingbroke, Pulteney, Defoe, and Smollett, down to the period of Johnson and "Junius." But it required a new convulsive popular upheaval to bring about another form of engine for the circulation of public opinion. The American Revolution, in 1775, and the French Revolution, fourteen years later, gave birth to the present form of newspaper, when that powerful organization became a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tribune of the people, more potent for the sustenance of law and order than any courts of justice or military force. Kings were to go in dread of it; corporations and all the social and commercial conspiracies that have oppressed the people were on better behavior; politics was its plaything.

I have seen some of the papers issued previous to 1789, and when comparing them with the journals of this day, they are as the old semaphore to the electric telegraph; as the rude steam pump, as Watt found it, compared with the engines of this period; as the hand press is to the monster steam press of Hoe. Let us feel assured that if there had always been newspapers, and readers for them, there would have been no "dark ages." The French Revolution of '89 gave freedom to thought, and made the press, as we have it, possible. And if the Reign of Terror was necessary to deal a mortal blow to the despotism of privileged classes, and to erect the tribune of public opinion, before which monarchs and governments are now obliged to bend their necks, then that hideous period was a blessing, out of which the genius of modern civilization was born and baptized in blood,—as great worldly blessings have always been, since our Saviour suffered on the cross, down to John Brown, who suffered on the gallows.

The advent of the people to power effected a natural change in the world; society lost much of its dignity, both in public and private life. Manners, like dress, were lowered; classes were confused, rather than levelled; there was less refinement, less self-respect, everywhere. But nowhere in the sum total that goes to constitute civilization was there more suffering than in the ornamental arts of literature, painting, and the drama.

It is our present concern to appreciate how far the newspaper press has contributed to this decline; and if the drama be selected as a special example, it is because I know more about this department than any other. Some ten years ago I ventured to express some opinions on this subject in the North American Review, and my articles were roughly handled by the journalists of London and Paris; but it was satisfactory to note that no reply was made to the facts composing my argument: their remarks were principally personalities, which went to confirm, rather than to enter any defence to, the indictment.

At first the newspaper began to circulate news only. Press notices of the arts were for the most part *newsy*, not critical.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The persons employed to "do the theatres," or to "do the fine arts," were employés whose duties were those of reporters, and the leading morning journals in London were served in this manner even so lately as 1843. The drama, the opera, and the fine arts were reported for the London *Times* by the clerks attached to its commercial department, or the reporters whose more important offices were to attend flower-shows and public dinners. About this time the *Morning Post* attracted attention by a series of brilliant articles on the theatre and on the Academy, by Mr. Charles Rosenberg. The *Times* and other evening journals awoke to the importance of these matters, and Mr. Oxenford was advanced to the special department of the drama, while Mr. Davison was engaged for musical criticism.

But newspaper criticism of dramatic work is rendered impossible, subjected, as it must be, to the conditions and necessities of the daily press. The performance of a new play or a new opera terminates at or about eleven o'clock. The journalist must have his copy in the hands of the compositor by half-past twelve! Now, within these ninety minutes he should deliver himself of a thoughtful, well-digested essay on what may be an important addition to the literature of the age. It is contended that, whatever practice and experience he may have, it is impossible that he can accomplish the task with justice to the dramatist, to the actors, or to himself. It was suggested that a reporter should undertake the mere detailing of the news—how the dramatic work was received, a description of its plot, and the applause or censure of the public, recorded as a fact; subsequently the journalist should step in, and present his careful and profound study of the play.

But this proposition was rejected by my opponent with contempt. Yet it was thus in France some years ago; it was thus that Jules Janin, Théophile Gautier, Fiorentino, and other brilliant critics sustained the stage. Let it be remembered that there are three component parts in a dramatic exhibition: the author who writes, the actors who represent, and the public that receives and appreciates. Of these three the public is, in the estimation of the artists, the most important. And, indeed, it was so, when it exercised freely its powers of appreciation, and thus brought forward the great dramatists and the great actors, whose lives were ended when the press

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undertook to judge for the masses. In fact, it exercises no such universal sway, but the players believe it does; the dramatists reluctantly are led to believe so, too, for managers are misled by its praise or its censure to encourage or neglect according to its directions or its supposed influence. As a matter of fact, it has never been able to kill a good play, or to injure irremediably a good actor, because its chief power is exerted only during a very brief period, while the play or the actors send forth a bulk of the spectators, night after night, to testify as to their merit. So the temporary impression of the press is overcome; but it does exercise such an influence that a poor entertainment is advertised into a success, and the career of a young artist, who may have some merit, is destroyed by reckless censure or ribald abuse.

When the artist discovered that there was a royal road to fame, and that success might be obtained by cultivating notoriety in type, he said to himself: "Nineteen men out of twenty are fools. I have no use for the twentieth man. The nineteen help themselves to brains out of the newspapers, which are served fresh every morning. They shall serve me interleaved with the newspapers. Advertisement is fame; advertisement is fortune. The best advertisement is on the editorial page; instead of paying a dollar a line, let me capture the critic, for his name is 'Boom'."

This state of affairs has demoralized the branch of art with which I am humbly connected, and I am informed that it has in a similar manner demoralized other branches of art, in which even great men aspire to succeed by and through press notices rather than by public appreciation and favor; or, to speak more correctly, they seek to obtain such public appreciation by favor of the press.

During this century, the arts have declined as the press has pretended to assume authority. During the last fifty years no great dramatists, no great actors, no great composers, no great painters have appeared!—none, at least, that can compare with those that graced the preceding century, from 1740 to 1840. We have none to remain as monuments to mark this present period. The leading actors and actresses are obliged to hark back half a century to find plays of sufficient importance to compose a *répertoire*. Such a desolation is unprecedented in the history of those countries, where great artists have hitherto been produced to adorn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successive ages. I commenced public life in 1841, but my memory reaches back to 1837 or 1838. Between that date and 1842, in the short space of three or four years, I witnessed the production of "The Lady of Lyons," "Richelieu," "Money," "Love's Sacrifice," "Ion," by Talfourd, and "The Bride of Messina," "Love," and "The Love Chase," by Knowles. I omit half a dozen other plays, because they have not held the stage. To the above list I may be allowed to add "London Assurance," "The Irish Heiress," and "Old Heads and Young Hearts." Here we find eleven important dramatic works produced in rapid succession. It seems almost incredible to record that, since that time and during half a century, *not one* dramatic work of similar calibre and importance has been produced and lives! Is it not worth while investigating why this prolific source suddenly became dried up?

At this same period, viz., in 1840, there existed in London companies of comedians occupying the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, and Covent Garden, fully equipped for the performance of the works of the great English dramatists; for example, let us enumerate the actors composing the ordinary company at Covent Garden:

Vandenhoff.	Meadows.
Anderson.	Mrs. Warner.
Macready.	Helen Faucit.
Elton.	Mrs. W. Clifford.
Waide.	Mrs. Orger.
Bennett.	Mrs. Keely.
Phelps.	Miss Fairbrother (now Duchess of Cambridge).
Bartley.	
Harley.	P. Horton.
Keely.	Taylor.
Webster.	

These are, all of them, historical names in the drama, all stars of the first magnitude, all grouped in one company. At this moment it would be a difficult task to cast "The School for Scandal," if we searched the whole English-speaking world, Great Britain, the United States, and Australia, to bring into one company artists capable of performing that single comedy even tolerably well. Let it be suggested, rather than asserted, that the invasion of burlesque, so-called comic opera, horse-play extravaganza, spectacle of the prurient kind, negro minstrelsy (indeed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much of the modern drama appears to me to be negro minstrelsy with white faces), and entertainments of this kind, have absorbed and demoralized our best comedians. Then the polyglot tragedy, the Anglo-Teutonic-French drama, has driven the native play into the back-ground.

A French *Hamlet* and a German *Juliet* have introduced new readings of Shakspere—so to be admired that our own tragic actors and actresses study the foreign inflections of voice and manner! And why not, argued an æsthetic dude the other day, for "was not *Hamlet* a Dane and *Juliet* an Italian?" It had not struck me to reconcile matters in that fashion.

It may be asked how the newspaper press is concerned in all this? Is it not the natural growth of things? *On récule pour mieux sauter!* I confess I do not see the *sauts*—at least, not spelled that way. The press claims to be the organ of public opinion. If, in the monopoly of that function, it has displaced and superseded the select public, the *dilettanti*, that used to stand on guard over a new play or a new actor to censure faults or encourage to further effort; if it has, so to speak, disbanded this gallant troupe, and elected itself to this office, it must accept the responsibilities which seem to me to attach to the exercise of power, and be largely answerable for the results. Has not the lowest, tawdriest kind of entertainment been encouraged? Has not the buffoon been idolized? Has not the tenure of the drama been confirmed to the mountebank? If it be contended that the tide of public taste cannot be stemmed by any forces, but will have its own way, I reply that managers, actors, and authors can be affected by a combined and persistent remonstrance of the press, and if it can combine and persist, the supply of vulgarity, wantonness, and imbecility which now form the staple of public entertainment will be cut off, or so far reduced as to be no longer an abomination and reproach to the age. Maintain the supply, and you create the nuisance you affect to deplore. The leaders of thought, the most eminent pastors of the church, already recognize the value of the stage as a civilizing agent, while the most offensive of its features are subjects of admiration in the columns of the newspapers, to which the manager points when visited by remonstrance, and the actors refer when reproached with their degradation. The stage regards the journalist as its natural enemy. If a favorable notice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appears of some actress, it elicits the remark that she has a friend on the *Herald;* if an actor be censured, the question is asked, "What have you done to the *World?*" No one dreams that the journalists are writing conscientiously. All this feeling on the part of the artists should not exist.

It would be gratifying to me to state many eloquent things that my opponent said in reply to the above, but he has no wish to put them forward. He accused me of making use of the press when it suited my purposes, which I, impenitent, do acknowledge; he passed by the facts alleged (excepting the correction as to the foundation of the press, which I was mistaken in dating one hundred and fifty years ago, when it ought to have been two thousand five hundred), and assured us that I was generally mistaken in the views put forward; that I undervalued the authors and actors of the period, over whom he threw such a floral tribute, and so smothered the question in rhetoric that I am now prepared to admit that Irving's edition of "Faust" throws the "Richelieu" of Bulwer into the shade, and "Paul Pry" cannot compare with the "Brass Monkey."

DION BOUCICAULT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ERRORS IN PROF. BRYCE'S "COMMONWEALTH."

BY GENERAL LLOYD S. BRYCE, M. C.

A GENTLEMAN who once attended the review of a German army corps told me that what principally struck him was the peculiar goose-step of the men. Then he described the shape of their canteens, the cut of their coats, and the glitter of their buttons. Mr. Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," puts me in mind of this observer. He studies the details, the pettinesses, and the minutiæ, and then proceeds to generalize therefrom.

Now, if his conception of these details be accurate, his generalizations may be correct; but if his conception of them be incorrect, his generalizations will be faulty. Mr. Bryce, in his details, is not always right; indeed, he is often in error.

Let me take his statements concerning Congress. I will point out a few of his errors here, if only to show with what caution his other details must be accepted, and how faulty his generalizations must be.

In the first place, he says that there have been ten extra sessions of Congress called, while in reality there have been eleven. Again, the two parties are strictly divided on the floor, in spite of his assertions to the contrary. The only exception to this rule is that, when one party largely preponderates, seats have to be found for the excess on the other side. Passing before the Speaker is never enforced, and one-fifth of those present can authorize a call of yeas and nays, instead of one-fifth of a quorum, as Mr. Bryce states.

Not an hour and a quarter, but one half-hour, is required for reading the roll-call, and Mr. Brown, the present reading clerk, has done it in twenty minutes.

No member may speak more than once to the same question, says Mr. Bryce; but this rule is more honored in the breach than in the observance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The previous question is now put in this form: Shall the previous question be ordered?—not as Mr. Bryce states that it is put. Indeed, Mr. Bryce must have lamentably misunderstood his informant, when he claims to have been told that without closure, or the previous question, we should never get appropriation bills through; and the reason that Mr. Bryce blundered here is the very sufficient one that there is *no* previous question in the Committee of the Whole, where all appropriation bills are necessarily considered. If Mr. Bryce were here now, he would hardly have been struck by the way in which the minority of the House submits to the "despotism of the majority," for at the present writing one man holds in check the entire House, and this is the sixth day that he has done so. On the contrary, it is, rather, the submission of the majority to the minority that strikes with most wonder any one who knows anything about Congress.

No member can speak twice to any question, continues Mr. Bryce, in Committee of the Whole, until every member desiring to speak shall have spoken. This rule is not observed, for the very good reason that in so large a body it would be impracticable. Select committees do not last for one session only, as Mr. Bryce states, but either until the object for which they have been called together is accomplished, or until the close of the entire Congress.

Further on Mr. Bryce says: "A motion may be made in the House that the committee do report forthwith, and the House can, of course, restore the bill, when reported, to its original form." This is absolutely incorrect and never was the rule or practice. The only way in which the committee can be discharged from further consideration of a bill is by a suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote—a motion which is in order only two days in the month. "After a bill has been debated and amended by the committee, it is reported back to the House and is taken up when that committee is called in its order." This does not give a fair idea of the procedure. While there is a rule providing for the call of committees, it is substantially a dead-letter and has accomplished nothing.

"In neither House of Congress are there any Government bills," continues the same authority. This statement gives an entirely erroneous impression. The heads of departments, at every session of Congress, prepare drafts of bills, which are submitted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Congress, relating to the details of their respective departments, and also Government bills that have a wider significance. An instance of the last is the present Mills Tariff Bill, the framing of which was made in the Treasury Department, at the request of the President and on the lines suggested by his tariff-reform message. The Fishery Bill is another, the Chinese-Exclusion Bill is a third, and the Indian Severalty Bill is a fourth.

These errors that I have touched upon are principally technical, but I now arrive at a more serious comment on his work,—namely, that he has lamentably failed to appreciate those deeper currents beneath the surface of American life which are already beginning to agitate the community. He leaves, by his picture, as he expressly states, nothing for the poorer classes "to fight for," and has sketched a scene of blissful comfort little short of Paradise. In truth, he takes little, if any, notice of the growth of discontent.

How far is this discontent reasonable, and how is it likely to endanger our institutions? Is it the result of the aggregation of large fortunes, or of the methods by which so many of these have been acquired?

One hears so much demagogic talk on this matter that the conservative instinct of any temperate man is usually disgusted; but from a conservative stand-point especially this subject ought to be met, as the very existence of conservatism is involved. This I hold to be the conservation of our institutions, not only in their letter, but in their spirit. Roughly speaking, these vast aggregations of wealth in the hands of individuals are the result of railroad building or of its management and the coöperation with the railroads in limiting the prices of the necessaries of life. A railroad company obtains from Congress a grant of every alternate section of land through which it passes. In many cases the roads fulfill the stipulated conditions, but in many it must be admitted that they do not. Once in operation, however, they make bargains for carrying freight with the large producers along their lines. These combinations enable the preferred shipper to sell at greatly reduced rates and naturally to crowd out the smaller competitor; then when the former has once secured the market, the price of his commodity is raised, as was recently witnessed in respect of oil. Of course it is impossible to describe, within the limits at my command, the various phases these combinations with railroads

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take, but they exist in every branch of production, and the Inter-State-Commerce Commission is, for the most part, powerless to prevent them, as it is even now seeking an enlargement of its jurisdiction. Now, much of the complaint, as I have said, against these railroads is so extravagant as to create a reaction almost in favor of their manner of conducting business. You hear them vilified as if they had done no good to the community; as if they had not built up the countries through which they pass; as if they ought to be destroyed, root and branch, without regard to the many innocent persons who hold their securities. This outcry is, for the most part, from the granger classes,—that is, from the outside,—but nothing that can be urged against the railroads by the most blatant demagogue can equal the infamy of their management as viewed from the inside; I mean from the stockholder's stand-point, from the stand-point of orphans, of widows, of people, rich and poor, who have invested their all in these *in*securities, and who stand to the managers of the roads in much the same relation that the people who crowd around the gambling-tables stand to the croupier. But the stockholders' rights find few defenders in any proposed solution of the railroad question.

Besides the combinations mentioned above between railroads and shippers, there are combinations between large producers themselves, having for their object the destruction of smaller competitors. Thus there are combinations to destroy any person who starts in the oil business, in the business of coal-mining, in the sugar-refining business, in the steel business; and there are also combinations among the sellers to keep the products of every one but those belonging to their limited circle out of the market. In Chicago, the control of the market for selling beef has practically ruined the industry of cattle-ranching, while the recent corner in wheat in the same city has forced up the price six cents per bushel. Then there are combinations to hold grain, during times of scarcity, for a rise, as there are said to be combinations to corner coffins when men have died of want; and though much of the evil comes from natural causes, and is undoubtedly the result of the industrial system, we have accentuated the hardship by the enormous scale on which our operations are conducted. At all events, the fact remains that we have developed, during the last ten years, a class of fortunes with whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

magnitude few European fortunes can compare, and pauperism has increased correspondingly with their growth.

This last is a fact we hate to acknowledge, but it cannot be gainsaid. Turn to the official report of Mr. Ford, of the Congressional Investigating Committee. He shows that it costs the State of New York, with some five millions of people, the income at four per cent. of five hundred millions of dollars yearly to support its paupers; in short, twenty millions of dollars must be taken for this purpose from five millions of inhabitants, of whom about one in five is a wage-earner. It follows, therefore, that one million of workers have to pay at a rate of twenty dollars per year apiece for the support of their paupers. And Mr. Ford assures me that the revelations as to the increase of pauperism made by such authorities as the heads of poor-houses, asylums and other eleemosynary institutions, actually startled the committee.

Now, there have been bills directed against these combinations, often with the only object of blackmailing them. There have been bills, too, nominally directed against them, but really at the instance of the ring-masters themselves, in anticipation of hostile legislation. Congress, however, does little besides talk on the subject, partly because it recognizes the danger of legislating on it without injuring innocent people, and partly because it knows that, when it does attempt to legislate, the Senate frustrates its action. Indeed, the history of the Inter-State-Commerce Act is a perfect illustration of this statement, for at the present moment the Commission is vainly seeking to acquire the powers granted by the original Reagan House bill, which was emasculated and rendered nugatory by the Senate. But the whole bias of Mr. Bryce's mind seems to favor the check that the Senate exercises upon Congress. Because no laws are made directly against the laboring classes, he thinks that these classes have no right to complain. He forgets completely that no specific laws are necessary where the laws we have so amply accomplish the purpose.

But it is not alone the manual workers that appear to have a right to complain. On the contrary, you might extend that right to all classes in every field of industry outside of the possessors of gigantic privileges. You might extend it to the possessors of fixed incomes without regard to their magnitude, for all these various people are feeling the pressure. The man engaged in re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fining sugar on a capital of fifty thousand dollars finds that our existing laws enable those refining it on a capital of ten millions to combine and drive him out of the market with the loss of his entire plant. The man who is mining coal on a corresponding scale finds the same process working against him; and, coming down to the man with a fixed income, even he discovers that the present laws enable the stock market to be manipulated, through false statements and reports touching the conditions of the properties in which he has invested his savings, so as to endanger his entire capital. You say that this is the result of the industrial system. To a great extent it is, but we have accentuated the evil by special privileges to corporations, by special legislation, and by a laxity in enforcing the laws we have.

Now, Mr. Bryce has put his finger on the sore spot of American institutions,—for it is useless to deny that lobbying exists in mots of our legislative bodies,—but, with a lamentable lack of philosophical insight, he has failed to point out the consequences of the disease. What is lobbying? Is it, generally speaking, an attempt to influence unduly a legislative body in a line of legislation that may not be for the interest of the public, or, on the other hand, an attempt to retard legislation on some measure that it may be for the public interest to secure.

The result is always, however, special legislation, which usually has for its object private gain. Thus private fortunes are built up at the expense of the public, and in a way that falls little short of direct jobbery. There is also a manner of securing special legislation that is indirect, and which, I regret to say, fails to meet with the severe criticism it should. I will give you an example. "A" has a special scheme on hand, and desires to get it adopted. Our representative bodies are largely made up of lawyers whose partners are engaged in active practice. "A" goes to one of these partners, and gives a fee of twenty thousand dollars, we will say, for the drawing up of a brief, where two thousand would be the ordinary emolument. Not a word may be said as to the purpose of this over-payment, but the implied obligation is that "B," who is in the legislative body, shall present the bill based upon the brief, and force it to a satisfactory conclusion. The passage of this bill and its enactment as law mean a million of dollars for "A." Here we see the process of millionaire-making, and it is just here that our laxity and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political carelessness accentuate the harshness of the industrial system. The investigation of the Alaska Commercial Company in the Forty-fourth Congress may make my meaning plain.

The legislature in every State is more or less affected with lobbying, while the condition of some of our city boards of aldermen could hardly be worse if we seated therein the inmates of our prisons. Why, the government of New York City could have been run in an economical manner solely on the income that the franchises she has squandered annually pay to the privileged holders. Therefore, the privileged holders became wealthy, and the poor, at least in our cities, grow poorer. How do the last become poorer? Simply by the increased taxation that this squandering has rendered necessary. How does increased taxation make the poor poorer? By raising the rate of their tenements. It makes them more wretched beyond what they are made by increased house-rent, simply because there is just so much less that the city has left to expend on parks, on cleaning the streets, and on sanitary improvements, which are the very improvements that the poor and wretched require most.

Now, the harshness of the above conditions is largely mitigated by the opportunities a new country offers, and in these opportunities Mr. Bryce loses sight of the logic of the discontent; but the new country is every day, every hour, becoming an older country, and the difficulty in finding new careers is growing apace.

Again, because a man has no patent of nobility distinguishing him as belonging to a particular class, Mr. Bryce endeavors to make out that we have no classes. But the few already have the essential elements that constitute class distinction—power and wealth. The rest is but the varnish, the veneer, put on the finished article.

Mr. Bryce forgets, too, that we are not living in a military age, but in a railroad age, and that the titles appropriate to the one would be out of place in the other.

It is hardly a strain of the imagination to look forward to a new nomenclature of aristocracy, adapted to the changed conditions of society—"the President of Erie," "the Director of Western Union," "the Boss of Tammany." The only reasons such designations now sound odd are that as yet little social distinction is connected with them, that true refinement has not yet had time to attach to the possessors of all of them, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the environment of other possessors is not as yet what people of corresponding wealth would have about them in Europe. The last objection, however, is quickly being removed, and the tendency to adopt the more ceremonious usages of European life follows the march of civilization westward.

In many ways a plutocracy has less to recommend it than an aristocracy. It has no traditions to endear its members to the people and to atone for their errors. It has seldom suffered and never bled for its country. It has less sense of responsibility and rarely enters the political arena save further to enhance its gains. "Gentlemen," a certain railroad magnate is said to have once observed, when asked his political affiliations, "when I am in a Republican district, I am a Republican; when in a Democratic district, I am a Democrat; but I am always and every time an Erie man."

Again, an aristocracy has its throne in the country; a plutocracy in cities. Save in Ireland, where race and religion serve to augment the harshness, the relations between landlord and tenant are generally not unkindly. Indeed, in Ireland it has more frequently been the absence of the landlord than his presence that has brought the system into ill favor. In short, while the predominating feature of an aristocracy is the system of landlord and tenant, that of a plutocracy is the system of mortgagee and mortgageor, wherein the relations are legal, rather than personal, and naturally prevent the interchange of those little kindnesses that so largely affect the lot of man.

But whether the system of landlord and tenant is good or bad, I have seen it stated (though I am not able, through the scantiness of official statistics, to verify the statement) that there are at present one quarter of a million more tenants paying rent to landlords in the United States of America than in England, Scotland, and Wales combined. Now, it seems to me that any one who believed in representative government would perceive that the relief for all these evils could best be found by the full discussion of them in the popular branch of our Government. But Mr. Bryce, from the outset, shows his contempt for representative government by the slur he casts upon Congress. In speaking of its members, he says a Congressman "seems to move about under a *primâ-facie* suspicion of being a jobber, and to feel that the burden of proof lies on him to show the contrary."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Bryce regards the House, too, as a "ruthless body," and emphasizes the wise check that the Senate exercises over it. But it must be remembered that a Senate is a far stronger body than a house handicapped by such a name as a House of Peers. The Senate can originate supply bills, and it can completely alter revenue bills by amendments. For instance, when the present Tariff Bill came back from the Senate, Major McKinley, in the House, openly asserted that the House had made one bill, and the Senate another, and that, as they possessed certain features in common, a conference ought to be appointed to settle the differences. A wise conclusion; only the premises went to the root of all representative government, viz., that seventy-odd gentlemen, representing Statehood—in no wise the people—could decide how the people should be taxed. You say that, representing Statehood, the Senate *does* represent the people. I say it does not, and for the incontrovertibility of my statement we need only turn to the largest and wealthiest State in the Union, New York, which has had two Republican Senators ever since Francis Kernan's day, despite the many times she has gone Democratic.

In my opinion, the Senate is not irresponsible for many of the evils which I have touched upon, through this very power of checking the popular will. If you wish an instance, I will take its action in refusing to confirm the forfeiture of unearned land-grants where it was clearly shown that the railroads had failed to fulfil the conditions on which the land had been given to them. Probably no one measure has had more to do with building up these phenomenal fortunes.

Again, there is a pronounced tendency for men whose only recommendation is their wealth to buy their way into the Senate. But still more dangerous than this, still more hazardous to the community, since it works insidiously, is the tendency towards special legislation in the Senate arising from the practice of receiving fees through the law firm of which some particular Senator is a member.

Special legislation builds up special privileges; special privileges build up private fortunes; and private fortunes built up by special legislation are a detriment and an insult to the community. Thus the few grow richer and the many grow relatively poorer; not so much because the Senate has so many rich men in its bosom, as because it has enough greedy ones often to effect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislation. In this case, they become the agents of wealthy corporations and regard their high places much as brokers regard their seats in the Stock Exchange.

Because Mr. Bryce can see no likelihood of a military despotism, he sees no danger in store for us. He forgets that each epoch has its own particular danger. We live in a commercial age—not in a military age, let me repeat; and the shadow that is stealing over the American landscape partakes of a commercial character. In short, the shadow is of an unbridled plutocracy, caused, created, and cemented in no slight degree by legislative, aldermanic, and congressional action; a plutocracy that is far more wealthy than any aristocracy that has ever crossed the horizon of the world's history, and one that has been produced in a shorter consecutive period; the names of whose members are emblazoned, not on the pages of their Nation's glory, but of its peculations; who represent no struggle for their country's liberties, but for its boodle; no contests for Magna Charta, but railroad charters; and whose octopus-grip is extending over every branch of industry; a plutocracy which controls the price of the bread that we eat, the price of sugar that sweetens our cup, the price of oil that lights us on our way, the price of the very coffins in which we are finally buried; a plutocracy which encourages no kindly relation between landlord and tenant, which has so little sense of its political duties as even to abstain from voting, and which, in short, by its effrontery, is already causing the unthinking masses to seek relief in communism, in single-taxism, and in every other ism, which, if ever enforced, would infallibly make their second state worse than the first. No observant mind can have failed to notice the socialistic trend of thought in the nature of bills introduced in Congress. To be sure, they never became laws, and it is very fortunate that some of them do not.

For instance, there is a bill, I am told, nominally drawn in the interest of the Eight-Hour Law that would make it a penal offence for a ship's captain to employ his men under any circumstance over eight hours any one day. Thus, if the vessel struck a leak and could not be pumped out in those eight hours, the captain would have to go to prison on landing, had he, to save the lives of his crew, made them pump five minutes over the allotted time. Again, there is a bill which would prevent bands of music in certain localities from playing "Hail Columbia," if it were not allowed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the musical union. But ridiculous as many of these bills are, they strike a note of warning. The note of warning is, not of Cæsar, but of Augustus,—a premature Augustus,—who ought to come in a country's decadence, not in youth, and who brings in his train socialistic legislation. In short, so much wealth has been piratically obtained, that it is making the honestly-acquired wealth that you and I possess, a stench in the poor man's nostrils. On this temper of the public mind all agrarian legislation is based. Therefore I raise my voice, not as a radical, but as a conservative, against allowing liberty to degenerate into jobbery, equality into vulgarity, and—what is especially dangerous—fraternity into an amiable negligence in enforcing the law against criminals in high place.

Mr. Bryce sees America through the rim of a champagne-glass, to the strains of soft music, and in the smiles of fair women. He sees what America should be, but what it is not; and to close our eyes to the true state of the case is to prevent the redress of evils which, if allowed to go on unabated, will infallibly make Democracy a by-word in the vocabulary of nations.

LLOYD S. BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ADAPTIVENESS OF NATURE.

BY GRANT ALLEN.

It was a favorite point of poor Hugh Miller's, in the days just before the evolutionist philosophy came, like a flood, to overthrow his crude and half-digested cosmical system, that fruits and grains first appeared upon the earth in any numbers on the very eve of the advent of man, late on in the course of the Tertiary period. It seemed to Miller, as to many of his contemporaries, that edible fruits were created beforehand for that very purpose—set there, in short, as the English church-service naïvely words it, "so as in due time we might enjoy the same." Nature thus appeared to make herself ready in anticipation for that final flower and head of creation, man, who was to become thereafter her lord and master.

How far we have left those ideas behind! We know nowadays that such a conception as this is biologically faulty; that every part of every organism has prime reference only to that organism's own internal heads, without reference to any one else's convenience in any way. But there is, nevertheless, a certain sense in which this curious premature generalization throws real light both on the origin of fruits and grains, and on the origin of man and the higher monkeys. While it is *not* true that fruits were developed beforehand in order that in the fullness of time man might pick and eat them, it *is* quite true that for man and the apes they were really developed, and that without them man and the apes could never even have begun to exist. They were mutually necessary. The evolution of the two went on collaterally, and each involved the simultaneous existence and evolution of the other.

The great grain-producing and fruit-bearing families of plants, and the apes, monkeys, and progenitors of man, first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appear, geologically speaking, in the Tertiary period. Now, the distinctive mark of the monkeys, as a group, is the possession of hands, and the hand, in turn, points them out as essentially arboreal and fruit-eating animals. It is true that some of the quadrumana—man in particular, as well as the baboons, chimpanzees, and gorillas—have taken at last to a more or less terrestrial existence; but the hand as a hand could never have been first developed under terrestrial conditions; it needed for its original evolution a forestine life, though, when once acquired, it would easily be employed for purposes far different from those which gave it rise at the outset. All the most forestine animals on earth—the marsupial opposums themselves included—possess in a greater or less degree the opposable thumb, which is the true key-note of the genuine hand; and even the fruit-eating birds, like the parrots, have independently developed under similar conditions a closely analogous grasping organ.

Arboreal animals possess, as a rule, great agility, power of balance, and muscular flexibility. Practice implies all these qualities, and natural selection, acting by the destruction of the slow or clumsy, still further insures them in an arboreal species. Moreover, tree-haunting animals live generally on very rich and nutritive food-stuffs. If they were mere herbivores of the ordinary grass-eating type, they would thrive better upon the open plains, like buffaloes, deer, wild horses, and zebras. The mere fact that they have taken to the trees for a living in itself almost implies a more nutritive diet; for tree-haunters live mainly upon seeds and nuts, which are the very rich stores of food laid up by the plant for the nourishment of its own precious seedlings. Even arboreal rodents show us the tendency towards such richer diet in the case of squirrels, dormice, and other climbing species. The arboreal animals are smaller, as a rule, than the terrestrial ruminants, but they are quicker, more intelligent, more varied in their movements, and dependent upon richer and less bulky food.

See the sum of these differences put briefly: on the one hand, the cow, large, heavy, slow of movement, eating grass all day, requiring for its digestion a complicated stomach with its cud-chewing provision, and possessing hoofed toes, flat on the ground, inflexible, insensitive, and ill-adapted for conveying external information to the small brain; on the other hand, the squirrel, little, lithe, swift, active, feeding upon rich, oily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nuts and seeds, possessing sharp claws and prehensile feet, and capable of grasping an object all round in its paw, so as to gain a perfect knowledge of its true shape and its general space relations. In the one case, much food must be digested for little result in variety of movement; in the other case, little food need be digested for much result in building up nerve, brain, and muscle, and in complicated motions of the most diverse descriptions.

Now, of this advanced and agile arboreal type, the monkey race (taken as a whole) is the last term, the highest development. See what it involves. In the first place, it can hardly exist at all except in tropical or sub-tropical forests, where there is energy enough received by the earth from the sun's rays to produce in abundance the rich fruits and seeds in whose presence alone such a race is possible. Then, side by side with the evolution of the race, there must go the parallel evolution of the fruits and seeds, which must also benefit the plants that produce them, or else the producing species will become extinct at the hands of the monkeys. How can these conflicting claims be reconciled? This was the problem that had to work itself out in the tropical forests of the Tertiary period, and here is the way in which it seemingly worked itself.

Just in proportion as higher types of animals, both birds and mammals, made inroads upon the seeds of the tertiary period must the plants that produced them have responded to the demand by more and more strenuous means of protection. The faster the squirrels, monkeys, and parrots (or their remote progenitors and shadowy representatives) eat up all suitable seeds and fruits, the harder must the seeds endeavor (as it were) to outwit and defeat them. For only those seeds could grow into plants which could escape the close pursuit of the monkeys and parrots. At first sight, it seems as though the only possible result of such a conflict must be the extermination of the seed-eating tree-haunters; for, on the one hand, if the plant succeeds in repelling them, they must die at once; and, on the other hand, if the plant fails to repel them, and the seed gets eaten, they must die in the long run by cutting off the only means of reproducing their own supplies for the future. But in actual practice what has happened is this: The plant has turned the fruit-eaters into allies instead of enemies, by converting the outer portion of the fruit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into a soft, sweet pulp, though at the same time it covers the actual seed inside with a hard stone like that of the peach, the mango, and the apricot. Sometimes, too, to make assurance doubly sure, it fills the vital kernel with bitter and poisonous juice, as in the pips of the orange, or surrounds them with unpleasant and inedible hairs, as in the centre of the rose hip. The consequence is that the aggressive animal eats the outer pulp, but throws away the valuable seed to germinate and reproduce its like —and his food—in future.

Observe, now, further, how necessary is the coincidence of all these facts for the development of all the higher apes, and especially of man, their ultimate outcome. The large tropical fruits require hands (or something analogous) to pull and eat them. Hence the lemur-like or squirrel-like paw gets developed in true monkeys into the genuine hand, which is used in grasping, picking, and eating the fruit. How needful such a development is for fruit-eaters we see by analogy in the case of the like-minded fruit-eating birds, which either, as in the parrot, have a hand-like foot, or else, failing that, as in the toucans and hornbills, have a large and preposterously developed grasping beak to perform the same office. Even the squirrel holds his nut in his paws; the parrot holds it in one claw, hand-wise; the monkey, the highest and most specialized of all, holds it in a perfect hand, between thumb and fingers.

Furthermore, these tropical fruits and nuts have almost always a thick and disagreeable rind or husk, which must be stripped off and thrown away before the edible pulp or kernel is arrived at. The orange and mango are good cases in point. This disagreeable rind is put there by natural selection in order to repel insects, small rodents, and other useless creatures (from the plant's point of view), which would eat off the pulp on the tree, as wasps eat pears, without doing anything in return to disperse the seeds; but the animal that can pick the fruit can also tear off the rind, and in this act, also, hands or their equivalents come in useful. In all these ways the development of the fruits, and the development of the fruit-eaters, must necessarily have gone on by parallel stages.

We can see, too, if we reflect for a moment, that man could only have been evolved as we now know him through just such a tree-haunting ancestry as this. For, in the first place, man abso-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lutely bases himself upon the possession of a hand, which, first rudely stretched out to grasp the branches of trees, and afterwards further moulded by use in picking and stripping nuts and fruits, can at last be applied to such different uses from those by which it was originally developed. Then, again, the habit of grasping (as Mr. Herbert Spencer has shown) implies a wider conception of the physical properties of things; so that all the most intelligent animals in a state of nature—monkeys, squirrels, elephants, parrots—are those which have a grasping organ. Once more, specially nutritious food allows periods of comparative leisure, during which the faculties can be devoted to other objects, as we see in the restless curiosity of monkeys, in their gambols and antics, and finally in the artistic and industrial energies of man himself. If an animal lives upon grass or leaves, he has to concentrate almost all his vital activity on the mechanical labor of feeding and digesting; if he lives upon richer and more nutritious food, he has organic and muscular leisure in abundance. Man, by still further enriching his food-stuffs, through the deliberate selection and cultivation of fruits and cereals, and through the art of cooking, has allowed himself yet greater leisure for other arts, and so has attained his present preëminence.

But a consideration of his structure shows us conclusively that without the arboreal fruit-eating ancestors from whom he is descended, he could never have become just what he is. His hand is the index of his arboreal origin.

GRANT ALLEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DOES AMERICAN FARMING PAY?

BY THE HON. GEORGE B. LORING, EX-COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE.

THE assertion that there is no profit in American agriculture is so frequently and so positively made that it is almost universally accepted as true. Political economists, in discussing the sources of wealth, usually dismiss the great industry of agriculture as hardly coming within the range of their investigation. A purely agricultural section is apt to attract but little attention, as compared with the more active communities in which mechanical industries employ capital and stimulate faculties. And while human ingenuity is exhausting itself laying down the laws of commerce and establishing the methods of manufactures, the business of tilling the soil is allowed to pursue its quiet and unobtrusive way, guided by such light as can be drawn from practical experience. It cannot be said that the thoughtful students of social and civil affairs have a feeling of contempt for the business of farming, but it can be said that they are not inclined to consider it with the respect they feel for more attractive and demonstrative and imposing occupations. The attractions of estates all recognize; the fancy farms of prosperous merchants and manufacturers, and the results of their management, are too often charged to the business of farming, which is conducted in large measure and small as an industry on which a community depends for its subsistence.

The profits of this industry are not to be estimated by the wasteful extravagance of business entered upon for the gratification of taste, or by the failures of the idle and incompetent. It is not every ship that makes a prosperous voyage; it is not every mill that earns great dividends; nor is it every farm that remunerates the owner and cultivator. These three great industries occupy mankind, however, and the question of profits belongs to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all alike, and the success of all depends on the wisdom and skill with which they are managed, and on a judicious observance of the industrial laws of each locality. The chief end of man on earth is to supply what is wanting—the products of foreign latitudes, the products of the mill, the products of the soil, the products of the mind, all to feed and clothe and cultivate the race in accordance with surrounding circumstances. In this work the farmer does his share, and reaps his reward; and in America his opportunities vary as the soil and climate of the vast region stretching from the lakes to the gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, vary. The agriculture of America, therefore, has no universal characteristic. In that section where diversified industry prevails, and the land is cultivated to supply the local market, the accurate and careful work of the market-garden and the dairy has become a necessity, and profitable and valuable acres abound. In the remoter frontier regions, and in the newer States, on homesteads and newly-settled lands, the wholesale farming which supplies the staples, wheat and corn and beef and pork, to a general market, is the business to which the farmer must devote himself. In the cotton-growing States, while the social system has changed, and the old relations between labor and the land have been destroyed, the system of cotton-growing has remained the same, and the primitive methods have not been laid aside. On these three systems the agricultural industry of the United States has grown up from the simple employment which occupied three millions of colonists, and gave them all their subsistence and all their resources, to the varied toil of sixty millions of people, engaged in cultivating old lands and taking up new ones, and supplying the wants of markets near and remote with necessaries and luxuries, and in supporting all those public and private institutions which, of necessity, belong to a cultivated and independent and responsible people.

It is hardly reasonable to suppose that the various methods of managing the land and developing the resources of the country would have been adopted and pursued for generations, had they not furnished an ample reward to the land-owner and strength and vitality to the State. It was mixed farming which supported the colonies in peace and war, and it is mixed farming which has supported as an associate industry most of the older

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States since the formation of the Union. Upon the wholesale agriculture of the West, that vast region of great farms has flourished and grown into an active, populous, and wealthy agricultural empire. During the plantation days of the South, great fortunes were drawn from the soil, sufficient to secure the luxury and culture which belong to the great centres of trade and manufacture. But for the supporting power of the soil, the existence of an independent land-holding people, compelled to sustain themselves, without governmental aid, and intolerant of the subordinate position which goes with classification, caste, and legitimacy, would have been impossible. The profits of American farming can be estimated by the work it has accomplished in all those years during which the country was struggling for an existence, and in all those later years during which the power of the Republic has increased in population, wealth, resources, and influence beyond any possible expectation and beyond any example existing or recorded. An industry whose product has increased in twenty years, from 1859 to 1879, from $1,600,000,000 to $3,600,000,000, must have had a great deal to do with the growing prosperity of the country, and must have been attended by great individual success.

It is only necessary to look back from the present decade to the last, to obtain the most gratifying evidence of the progress of this country in the work of tilling the soil. Starting in 1870, at which time the country had reached an enormous production in proportion to the population, and making comparisons with the returns of 1880, we may learn what can be accomplished in a single decade by a people constantly increasing in numbers and occupying new lands. In 1870, the wheat crop was 287,745,626 bushels—in 1880, it was 459,667,032 bushels; in 1870, the amount of cotton raised was 4,352,317 bales—in 1880, it was more than 6,000,000 bales; in 1870, the amount of Indian corn raised was 760,940,594 bushels—in 1880, the amount was 1,744,449,435 bushels; in 1870, the crop of oats reached 282,107,157 bushels—in 1880, it reached 407,859,033 bushels; in 1870, the tobacco crop amounted to 262,735,341 pounds—in 1880, it amounted to 473,-107,573 ponnds. The increase of agricultural products was nearly one hundred per cent. in these ten years, and in the last year of this decade the increase was in even greater ratio than this.

The law of this vast and growing industry is the cultivation of those crops which are adapted to a local market, and the oc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cupation of land lying near that market. Not yet has this law become universal, it is true ; but it applies to all the older and thickly-settled sections of the country, and goes with diversified industries wherever they create large cities and towns. Fifty years ago the farmer was compelled to seek his market near home on account of the difficulty which attended the transportation of his crops. But the settling of new and remote lands, and the improved modes of transportation, rendered the growing of great staples possible and profitable, and corn, wheat, and provisions occupied the farmer's attention as he supplied remote and even foreign markets with his products. This frontier farming is but temporary, and must be followed by that systematic husbandry which constitutes the legitimate business of the American farmer, and carries him back to those days when agriculture was almost the sole business of the country, and when a prudent and industrious farming community was uniformly prosperous, even with the simplest management. While our large towns and our manufacturing cities provide markets for a large portion of the products of the West, they also support that more profitable system which consists in a careful cultivation of the soil and in the economical management of small farms. The trade and traffic which attend these systems of farming and this varied consumption are immense. New England requires about twenty million bushels of wheat, and produces only one million and a quarter. New York uses thirty millions, and grows about twelve. The supply of this deficiency comes from the West, from the Ohio Valley and the prairies west of the Mississippi and the Missouri, and costs from forty to fifty million dollars in years of good production—still more in years of comparative scarcity.

To assume, however, from the fact that New York goes west for six-tenths of her wheat supply, that wheat-growing is an unprofitable industry there would be an unsafe and unreliable conclusion. There are eight counties south of Lake Ontario which yielded, in 1879, six million eighty-six thousand eight hundred and seventy-six bushels on three hundred and seventy-seven thousand two hundred and sixty nine acres, or eighteen and six-tenths bushels per acre,—a rate more than fifty per cent. above that of Minnesota or Dakota and somewhat higher than that of California for the same year. In other lines of agriculture also New York excels. In the district lying eastward towards the Hudson and southward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

towards the Delaware, the dairy makes a production in butter and cheese worth far more than the grain procured from the West—a production not only supplying the home market, but also a large share of the hundred and forty millions of pounds of cheese exported. In the more populous sections of Dutchess and Westchester Counties and Long Island, the cultivation of market-gardens yields often, under favorable circumstances, a gross product worth a thousand pollars per acre; and in the neighborhood of New York city the product of market-gardening reaches millions of dollars. Ten years ago the census reported more than a million dollars' worth, and the present enumeration must, when tabulated, show an immense increase for this suburban district. The neighborhood of Boston and Philadelphia and every other large city is monopolized by market-gardens, and the country around Norfolk, Va., is mainly devoted to fruit and vegetables for northern consumption. The domestic fruits furnish a trade of large volume and value. New York city alone has a trade in this commodity of more than $9,000,000; Chicago, which supplies the Northwest, has about as much, and the other large cities of the country would swell the amount to about $60,000,000, including the large amount now sent from from our Southern latitudes. Could all the fruits sold in small cities and villages be added, and those consumed on the farms be enumerated, it is probable, judging from careful deductions from available data, that the annual value of the fruits of the United States would not fall much below $200,000,000.

Massachusetts, with her 2,000,000 of population, her 45,000 farms, and her 3,900,000 farm acres is also a good illustration of the type of American agriculture which increases year by year and which affords constant labor, and consequently good returns, to the farmer. In this State there are nearly 45,000 farms, in the management of which 78,000 persons are employed. The farms are small. In one of the most prosperous agricultural towns, containing 79 farms, 16 are less than 5 acres, 37 are less than 20 acres, and there is only one farm of over 90 acres. The aggregate value of the agricultural products of the State is $47,756,033, of which dairy products, hay, straw, and fodder make up nearly $24,000,000; the remainder of the list including fruits, meats, vegetables, animal products, poultry, wood products, and all articles of handiwork on the farm and in the farmer's family. This es-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

timate gives to each person employed in farming about $620 annually, out of which must come the expense of producing and selling the product—the total wages paid annually being $6,390,252. The business in which these persons is engaged is as various and diverse as the localities and the neighboring markets; and the result of their labors per acre will indicate the work in which they can profitably engage. The cereals yield about $25 per acre; tobacco produces $180; strawberries, $200; onions, $140; potatoes, $55; cabbages, $175. The total agricultural property of the State is valued at $215,230,550. It may be interesting to know that in the associate industry, manufactures, the capital invested is $303,806,185; the number of persons employed is 352,265; the product is $631,135,284; the annual wages, $128,315,362; the annual earning of each operative, $364; the annual product of each operative, about $1,800.

As an illustration of the growth and progress of a State almost purely agricultural, we may turn to the State of Iowa, which, 48 years ago, had only 43,112 inhabitants; 43 years ago was admitted into the Union, and now has a population of nearly 2,000,000. In presenting his report this year to the Governor, John R. Schaffer, the Secretary of the State Agricultural Society, impressed with the value of the farming industry, says: "A review of the condition of agriculture for the year necessarily includes moral and educational and commercial influences." He speaks for a State which has 185,351 farms, producing annually $136,103,473; a State which finds a market for a large proportion of its products beyond its own limits; a State which has less than 7,000 manufacturing establishments, producing less than $50,000,000 annually; a great, prosperous, agricultural State, the growth of less than half a century, the home of an industrious, thriving, well-educated people, of whom the Secretary also says: "There are progressive farmers who understand their business, are reducing it to a science, who avail themselves of every item of practical knowledge and who make it remunerative,"—a people the valuation of whose property amounts to $398,671,251. The products of this State, as indicated by available returns, are the result of general farming. On 173,940 acres were raised 19,742,190 bushels of potatoes in 1888. Of the corn crop for the same year the Secretary says: "The acreage is 7,797,000, representing a total product of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

321,629,962 bushels. The average price per bushel is twenty-three cents; commercial value of the crop, $73,974,891. This is almost equal to the value of all the gold, silver, and lead mined in the United States in 1886, which was $87,535,000. It is almost a larger sum than all the railroads in the United States paid in dividends on stock in that year. It is $8,000,000 more than the total net earnings of all the National Banks in America and is considerable more than the total dividends paid by those banks in 1887. It represents 46,605,715 bushels more than were produced in the great crop year in Iowa in 1879, and in wealth to the State nearly $13,000,000 more. It is 320,223,731 bushels more corn than was produced in the State in 1840."

When the wheat crop of Iowa failed, the farmers turned their attention to the dairy. They improved their cows largely by careful breeding and judicious feeding. On the first of January, 1887, they had 1,243,000 cows, valued at $32,541,792, and they produced butter and cheese to the amount of $277,477,429; milk, sold and condensed, amounting to $200,000,000, and skimmed milk to $50,417,054. The pasturage of the State is most luxuriant, and the valuation of the live-stock is $180,110,016.

The yield of oats on 2,713,166 acres was 78,681,814 bushels, valued at $15,342,953. The yield in 1840 was only 216,385 bushels.

The value of the grass crop in 1888 was $33,446,275, and the amount of wheat grown on 2,101,000 acres was 19,314,000 bushels; the wheat crop in 1840 having been only 154,693 bushels.

The hog crop of Iowa in 1888 was the largest in the States, being 4,148,811.

This agricultural wealth of Iowa is divided among less than two millions of people. The farms of the State are in good condition. The taxes are readily paid. The churches are well supported. The institutions of learning are well endowed. In the homes of the people will be found great comfort and ample means of mental and moral culture. An air of substantial thrift pervades the State; and while it may be impossible to obtain the exact profit of every acre and every crop, or to ascertain the income of every land-holder, it is easy to see that a wide-spread prosperity pervades the community, whose characteristics are the repose and self-possession which attend success; and this is true not of Iowa alone, but of all the great agricultural States of the West and Northwest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The value of farm lands will indicate the condition of the agriculture which enjoys the opportunity furnished by the industrial organization, especially occupying the larger portion of the United States. Land in the State of New York is valued at $44.41 per acre; in New Jersey at $65.16 per acre; in Vermont at $36.40 per acre; in Wisconsin at $23.30; in Massachusetts at $50.27; in Ohio at $45.97; in Illinois at $31.87; in Maryland at $32.33. Land, however, in the States where American enterprise is less developed, is valued at prices ranging from $4.70 to $10.89. It appears that farms command good prices and are in good demand where an enterprising and busy population is engaged in diversified industry and where a fertile soil yields a liberal crop; and they are in good demand because their cultivation is profitable. That there are unprofitable farms in many of the States is evident from the fact that they are abandoned by their owners. But it is a striking fact also that even where the number of farms diminishes, the agricultural products increase as the cultivation is transformed to more kindly acres. Farms well selected, well manned, well cultivated, are always profitable.

The prosperity of the American farmer is, in fact, unparalleled in any country on earth. In the old and more thickly-settled sections of our land the condition of the homesteads and gardens and fields bears witness to the thrift of the occupants. The improvement in our rural towns which are fortunately situated is almost equal to that of the populous manufacturing cities adjoining. Towns which half a century ago presented a decayed and dingy look, and whose gray repose spoke of sluggishness and discouragement, have risen, with no other industry than agriculture, to the appearance of an industrious and prosperous people. The town-hall tells of civil ambition; the ample school-house tells of faith in education and the ability to obtain it; the imposing meeting-house tells of religious devotion; the well-painted dwelling tells of good taste; and the streets tells of a desire for good order and neighborly courtesy. There is the town library. There is the well-furnished dwelling. There are the cultivated daughters and the intelligent and ambitions sons. There are pictures on the walls, and flowers along the pathway. And this is not an unusual scene. Go then to the newer and more sparsely-settled sections, and the story is similar. The farms are constantly improving. The mortgages with which the occupants began life as settlers are largely lifted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The early mode of life is changed for the better. One of our most careful observers and statisticians gives a most interesting record composed of replies to inquiries made of the holders of mortgages on Western farms. He says :

"In reply to my questions I have received ten communications, covering a term of years ranging from four to thirty-eight. A summary of the replies, disregarding fractions, is as follows : Number of mortgages, 200,000 ; total amount loaned, $180,000,000 ; average per mortgage, $900 ; already paid, 119,000 mortgages ; amount outstanding, $75,000,000 ; number of mortgages outstanding, 81,000. The total number of foreclosures is not given in all cases ; in some the amount is given, in others the number. The reduction in the rate of interest has been from ten per cent. annual interest and ten per cent. commission on a five years' mortgage to an average of six and a half to seven and a half per cent. at the present time, without commission."

Where is there another agricultural community from which these illustrations could be drawn ? Not, surely, the tenant farmers of England, or the distressed farmers of Ireland, or the peasantry of Central Europe.

That the prosperity of agriculture has kept pace with the increasing prosperity of every other industry in our land is manifest. The activity of the grain-growing sections has been and is great ; and the demand for the product of the pasture and the stall has been most encouraging to those who supply the market at home and abroad. The encouragement, moreover, of local and special crops has been so great that the farmer feels confident of securing a suitable reward for the labor which he applies to the careful and systematic tillage of the soil to supply local markets with what they require, and for the care which he bestows on the orchard and the dairy. The condition of the American farmer is looked upon as so satisfactory that the lesson taught by him is engaging the minds of some of the most thoughtful statesmen and publicists of the old world. The attention of the English farmer, discouraged by the agricultural depression around him, has been called to the contrast between the market gardens of America and the sheep-pastures which surround many of the great cities of his own country. It has been discovered that the American system of landholding is the foundation of great popular content and general prosperity, and accompanied, as it is, by great social and civil opportunities, surrounded, as it is, by the free institutions of our land, attended, as it is, by the schoolhouse and the meeting-house, and by the constant call to public service which occupies so many, it constitutes the foundation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on which rest great mental activity, great dignity of character, great enterprise and ambition. To the practical work of the agricultural community here, wide-spread disaster, moreover, is unknown. The local damage of a drought or a flood is not, indeed, unusual, but the extent of the American territory is such, the diversity of our soil and climate is so great, that the disasters seem to be circumscribed and accidental, while the prosperity is wide-spread and almost constant. With landed possessions, which are obliged to bear the burdens of heavy taxation, with wages of labor vastly greater than in any of the countries of Europe, with the personal requirements of the farmer and his family increased by social obligations and the natural demands of a free and responsible people, we have been able to compete in the grain markets of the world with those who, in some instances, are furnished with land free of rent and taxation, and whose necessaries of life are so small and whose duties are so few that the former seem intolerable and the latter seem insignificant and trivial. The skill of the American farmer, supplied as he is with the most ingenious and graceful and effective machinery, has become an object of admiration and imitation. The well-organized home of the American farmer is looked upon as a model. The place filled in the community by the American farmer is considered so important and honorable that other nations inquire how it has been attained. The crops of the American farmer are looked upon as so sure that all anxiety with regard to the supply of food for people less favored has passed away.

The rapid growth of agriculture in America may be made more apparent by recurring to its condition in this country three-quarters of a century ago. At that time the ploughs were usually made by the village blacksmith and wheelwright. Shovel factories were few and small. Grain-harvesters, reapers, mowers, tedders, and horse rakes were unknown. The mechanical enterprise engaged in producing these and other improved implements of husbandry during all these years has been untiring, and the result has been surprising. In one year the patents issued for improvements in agricultural machinery exceeded one thousand, of which thirty-six were for rakes, a hundred and sixty for hay- and grain-harvesters and attachments, a hundred and sixty-seven for seed-planters and drills, thirty for hay- and straw-cutters, ninety for cultivators, seventy-three for bee-hives, ninety for churns, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred and sixty for ploughs and attachments. Meanwhile, the vast increase of production, to which reference has already been made, indicates also the skill and energy of those who are engaged in the various branches of agriculture.

This unusual and extraordinary growth which has thus far attended American agriculture is due not only to the diversity of soil and climate, the rapid increase of population, and the vast improvement in agricultural machinery, but also to the independent ownership of land which characterizes American institutions. It were not easy to tell the strength and stimulus which come through the ownership of the soil to him who occupies it, has fixed his home upon it, and looks to it for his means of subsistence. The proportion of land-holders in the United States to the aggregate population is great, and it is significant when we consider the responsibilities resting upon them and the opportunities they possess. The increase in the number of farms during the twenty years between 1860 and 1880 is remarkable. The aggregate in the entire country in 1860 was 2,044,077; in 1880, 4,088,907. The increase by subdivision is largest in the cotton-growing States, where the share-tenant system prevails. In Texas the increase is both by subdivision and new lands, the area in farms having nearly doubled in ten years. In Alabama the increase is about 26 per cent., from 55,128 in 1860 to 135,864 in 1880. The South Atlantic group shows an increase of 72.3 per cent. in farms. In the Western States, also, the increase has been most remarkable. The number of farms in Illinois in 1880 was 255,741, as against 143,310 in 1860; in Indiana the number rose from 131,826 in 1860 to 194,013 in 1880; in Kansas it rose from 10,400 in 1860 to 138,561 in 1880; in Michigan from 62,000 to 154,000. In the older States also the multiplication was extraordinary. New York increased from 196,990 to 241,058 in the twenty years referred to; Ohio from 179,889 to 247,189; Virginia increased from 92,605 to 118,517. And among the Western States the number of farms in Wisconsin increased from 69,270 to 134,322.

A general survey of the agriculture of this country must impress the observer with the vigor, growth, and magnitude of the industry. That there is a vast investment in agricultural lands is perfectly manifest. That the occupants of the farms are in good condition is evident. That immigration still continues, and large tracts of land are taken up by those who leave the hardship of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old country for the prosperity of the new, is ample evidence that the promises have all been fulfilled. It is only necessary to contemplate the enormous internal commerce of the country in order to be impressed with the agricultural wealth of the Nation, and it is only necessary to examine the books of the savings-banks in the rural districts in order to be impressed with the financial strength of the farmers. It would seem unnecessary to add that all this work would not be done were it attended by loss, and that it could not be done year after year and generation after generation unless supported by a profit.

GEORGE B. LORING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAN OUR CHURCHES BE MADE MORE USEFUL?

BY THE REV. M. J. SAVAGE, THE REV. E. E. HALE, D. D.,
AND THE REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D. D.

THE Editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has asked me to reply to this question. For so much, then, he is responsible. But I alone am responsible for the answer.

What is the matter with "our churches"? That something is the matter is indicated by the mere fact that the question is asked. In my opinion, there is one thing so seriously the matter that all others can well afford to wait while this is being attended to. This particular something is so fundamental that no mere patching of defects, no mere superficial improvements, no mere revival or extension of activity in this direction or that, will prove adequate to the need. In order to become "useful," in the highest sense, this one radical defect must be remedied.

The churches were once regarded as of the highest conceivable use. Unless they can continue to be so regarded, then their mission is ended. For, though useful, they are not indispensable to the accomplishment of the many good, but comparatively minor, things in which at present they are engaged. In most of our great cities the care of the poor is in other hands, the churches only assisting larger secular organizations. The training of nurses, the support of kindergarten, sewing, and industrial schools, the hundred minor charities that so distinguish this age—these all could be carried on by other means. Nobody would think of organizing churches merely for such ends. And though the churches exercise an immense moral influence, any careful thinker will admit that mere ethics can be taught, perhaps as efficiently, and certainly at an immensely less expense, in some other way, while, though the churches would claim that nothing else could quite take their places as moral teachers, they would most surely be the first to assert that this alone would not satisfy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their pretensions, or justify their methods or even their existence.

Of what use, then, are the churches? This question needs to be frankly and honestly faced, that the present attitude of the world may be clearly seen. Everybody knows that the churches have no such hold on the faith, the reverence, or the practical life of the world as they used to have. Why? Everybody knows that thousands on thousands of people do not go near the churches. Why? Everybody knows that while among these thousands are many poor, many ignorant, many vicious, there are also quite as many who are not poor, not ignorant, not vicious. Indeed, a candid and impartial inquirer will be compelled to admit that the freer in thought and the more intelligent a man becomes, the less likely he is to think that the churches have any exclusive charge of anything that is indispensable to even his highest and noblest life. Why? That this is the situation is clear. What more important question then is there for us to ask than—*Why?*

If we really care to know, the answer is not far or difficult to seek. Early Christendom believed, without the thought of a question, in the supposed historical fact of "the Fall of Man." And *all* the orthodox churches of the last eighteen hundred years have come into existence for this one, sole, specific purpose—*the salvation of man from the supposed effects of the supposed fall.* Why a "supernatural revelation"? To tell men that they were "lost" and how they could be "saved." Why the prophets? To foretell to a waiting and hopeless world the coming "Saviour," and to become afterwards a supernatural proof of the revelation and of the deliverer's mission. Why the miraculous "incarnation," "birth," "sufferings," "death," "resurrection" and "ascension" of "the second person of the Trinity"? To reveal God's willingness to save, and to make it possible for him "to be just and the justifier of him that believeth." Why the church, with its doctrines, rituals, and sacraments? To be the perpetual witness, depositary, and administrator of the means and the gift of salvation. Why heaven? To be the home of the saved. Why hell? To be the endless place of punishment for those who should not accept the one and only condition of salvation. Not one dogma of the old churches, not one rite or sacrament, but presupposes the fall and consequent ruin of the race. And no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

careful thinker can suppose, for one moment, that, but for the belief in the fall, any one of them would ever have come into existence.

On this old theory, the world was simply a province of God's kingdom in rebellion. Every man, woman, and child was explicitly or implicitly a traitor. No one had any claim on the divine mercy. Salvation was a "free gift." If one was "elected" and another "passed by," there was no injustice in the punishment, only mercy in the saving. A man might be ever so "good," or moral, but this, as Mr. Moody once said, "don't touch the question of salvation." And, on that theory, this was right. When a man is executed for high treason, no one would think of pleading in his behalf that he loved his wife, was a good father, paid his debts, and was kind to his neighbors. All these considerations would be wholly irrelevant. They would be ruled out of court as not touching the case. The "natural" virtues of a person not in "a state of grace" would be only what they have well been called —"splendid vices." And if one trusted to them for salvation, they would only become perils to his soul. Therefore a person who lacked these virtues, who was so plainly a sinner that he would not be likely to imagine himself anything else, would be in a more hopeful case, as being more likely to feel his need and so accept the offered grace.

For eighteen hundred years the churches have been at work trying to save men from the supposed effects of the "fall." This has been the one thing for which they have existed. Whatever else they may have done, however bountiful their charities, whatever they may have done to heal the bodies or comfort the hearts of men, none have been readier than they to declare that all these things would have been as nothing, or worse than nothing, unless they had believed they were achieving the one great end of their being—the salvation of souls from "the pains of everlasting death."

Ask now, once more, the question why the churches have so slight a hold on the faith and reverence of men. Why do so many thousands neglect them? Why do so many of the best men and women feel that they are no longer essential to their highest and noblest life? We might as well face the fact—the churches might as well face it—that free-minded, well-informed people no longer believe in any "fall of man." Not only do they doubt it as many might doubt something that nevertheless has some strong

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proof in its favor; for the case is much stronger than this. It is demonstrated, beyond all intelligent question, that no such fact ever occurred in the history of man. What follows? Why this follows as inevitably as day follows night—that the very corner-stone of the popular theology has crumbled, and that the whole superstructure totters to its fall. If man is not "fallen," then he is not "lost," and, in that case, he does not need to be "saved." Take away the fall of man, and there is no need of "the scheme of redemption," no need of a supernaturally-inspired revelation, no need of an incarnation, no need of a supernatural or infallible church, no need of a Trinity, no old-time heaven for the chosen few, no endless hell for the doomed many. All these doctrines found their reason in the supposed fall, and with it they pass away.

Now, these doctrines are not mere unessential accidents of the churches; they are their essence and life—"bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh." And yet we are presented with the strange spectacle of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of ministers, in all the different churches, who—in private, at least—will frankly confess that they share the belief of all intelligent men in the antiquity and the slow and gradual development of the race from the lowest beginnings. They believe in no Genesis story of either Eden or Fall. And yet they go on preaching and administering the sacraments *as if nothing had happened.* Their one official business is *to proclaim a loss that does not exist, and offer a salvation that is not needed.* They know this, and confess it, and—*keep on doing it!*

And still they wonder that the churches are neglected, and get together in conventions to discuss ways and means for making them "more useful"!

But some man will say, Are there not such things as vice and crime and sorrow in the world? Do not men need help? Is not religion an essential and permanent element in human nature? Are not the churches great centres of sweet social influence and moral elevation? Doubtless. No one of all these things is called in question. The only trouble with them is that they are entirely one side the point at issue. There are vice and crime and sorrow, and it is the mission of a true religion to help and relieve the world from their power. Men do need help. Religion is not only a permanent, but the grandest, element in man. The churches, since they are organizations of kindly men and women,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do a vast amount of incidental good. But the question is as to whether they can be made "more useful." I believe they can.

But, in order to become more useful, the first and most important thing for them to do is frankly to recognize the facts of God, man, origin, destiny, and adapt themselves to them. Why should they longer expect intelligent men to come to them to hear a condition of things described in which they no longer believe, and listen to an offer of help that they no longer believe they need? To-day the larger part of the magnificent power of all the churches is thrown away. It is enough to make the angels weep to contemplate the picture. Magnificent buildings, millions of money, thousands of men, grand enthusiasms, marvels of patient labor, prayers and aspirations, all expended in the effort to deliver an imaginary man from the imaginary wrath of an imaginary God in an imaginary hell! If all the time and money and enthusiasm and effort had been spent in co-working with the real God in delivering the real man from his real evils, long before this the world might have been the Eden that never was, and that never will be until men intelligently combine to save man here and now from the ills that all can feel and see.

There is no use in railing at the past. "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but *now* commandeth all men everywhere to repent." "To repent." That means, in true Bible phrase, to *change their purpose.* This is the great need of to-day. In the light of the ascertained facts of nature and man, the churches need to repent,—to change their purposes and methods. The world is not going back to the old, the ignorant, the barbaric conceptions of the past. It is for the churches to say whether they will accept the newer, the fuller revelation of God. If not, they will but repeat the history of Judaism, being left behind by the wider and grander religion that keeps step with the advancing God.

For religion is not about to die; it is forever the attempt of man to find God and become progressively "reconciled" or adjusted to his perfect life. This is true, in their degree, of all religions. It has been true of the old churches of Christendom. The trouble, however, is this. It has been discovered that their conception of God, their conception of man, their conception of the actual relation in which man stands to God, and so their conception of what man needs in order to come into right relations with him—it has been discovered, I say, that all these concep-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions have been partial or mistaken. All this does not touch the great, fundamental religious *need* of the race. That remains. But it does compel a readjustment of thought, of theory, of motive, and so a radical change of purpose and method.

The churches, if true to their mission, do not exist for the mere sake of being either more or less "useful" in the minor matters of charity and beneficent help. They should stand for the great truth of the divine in human life. If they do that, all the rest will follow, as naturally as life-giving streams flow down into the valleys from the everlasting hills. The one thing, then, that, in this present juncture of human affairs, they need to do in order to become "more useful," is fearlessly to face the morning. If they fail in this, the better and more intelligent part of mankind must leave them behind. Then they will not only fail in the one great use that only the faithful church can attain, but their faithlessness here will weaken their life and unfit them for all minor uses as well.

M. J. SAVAGE.

IT must be remembered all along, in the consideration of these articles, that no method, of itself, is of any worth in this affair. Unless a church is a church,—that is, unless it binds together a body of Christian men and women,—no artificial methods will have any value. A church of Christ has a right to claim a certain succession to him in his work. If it works with the Holy Spirit, it can work the miracles which he promises. If it is not, it cannot; and all that is said as to methods of arrangement is said with the understanding of this fundamental principle.

With this understanding, I should say that the difficulty with churches in our large cities is that, to the people at large, they represent the life of only a very small proportion of the week. They are opened, perhaps, two or three times on Sunday; but to the great body of people they appear closed through all the rest of the time. To speak in the language of the world, then, they represent a "plant" or "investment" which is of use for, say, a twentieth part of the working time of most men, and I suppose that fraction about represents the amount of thought and attention which is, on the average, given to them and their work by men who are engaged in the business of the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We shall make our churches more useful, then, if the building is of use more often, and for a wider range of purposes than it is now used for; and if the congregation of worshippers understand that they exist as a congregation for many other purposes than that of united worship on the Lord's Day.

Of course, if they do not exist for any other purpose, that is the end of it. If a congregation is merely a religious club of people who have come together for the purpose of smoothing their own way to heaven, or enjoying the luxury of united worship in any of its forms,—if this is all they are for, that is all they will be. The congregation which comes together for this purpose cannot be relied upon for any other purpose.

But if we are to make churches more useful, the congregations must be churches. That is, they must be organizations, large or small, which have the work of Jesus Christ on their hands and wish to do what he did. Each congregation must wish to open the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf, to cast out unclean spirits, and to waken up people who are virtually dead into real life. It must be ready to abolish pauperism and to relieve the poor It must be ready to teach the ignorant and welcome the stranger.

In our Unitarian church, we have a maxim that the church must be organized "for worship, for education, for charity, and for hospitality." I think that a convenient sub-division. Without a sub-division, it may be said that the church exists that men may have "life more abundantly." And whatever a church does, so that people may have life more abundantly, belongs to its legitimate work.

I. It is not enough to throw this work upon the minister, or the minister and his wife, or the minister and the deacons or the elders. It is not a work which can be done wholly by proxy. The officers of a church can do a great deal, but they should be regarded as chiefs of staff, who have a right, sooner or later, to call upon the legitimate work of every individual in the company. According to their tact, knowledge of character, and understanding of their business, these calls will be made more or less wisely. But it is on the working force and inspired life of each individual that the success of the whole depends.

II. So soon as the Christain theology takes the place of what I call "mediævalism," a good many practical results appear, simply from that change. A mediæval church directs individuals to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

save each man his soul from hell. A Christian church, on the other hand, directs each man to bring in the Kingdom of God. Jesus Christ addresses people in the plural number, and so does his church. If a man wishes to save his own soul, and, of course, he must, he wishes at the same time to save the souls of other people, or to give them life more abundantly. So soon as men rise to Christ's level of thought in this business, they will be, themselves, trying to find out ways in which they can carry out his purposes for the relief of the sin and suffering of the world.

III. To approach more external detail, which, of course, must vary for every community, I have never forgotten what Newman Hall once said to me. He is very wise in this business, and, perhaps, has made his church as useful as any church in the world. He said that he thought it an advantage to have the people of his neighborhood used to coming into the building. He wanted them to regard it with friendly eyes. He, therefore, threw open the large body of the church itself, as many evenings as he could, for popular lectures, so that men who would not come near it on Sunday might have a feeling of gratitude to the church as an institution. I think that, perhaps, among a certain class of people in England there is a feeling of anger against "the church" which we know nothing of in this country. Certainly Mr. Hall wishes to attract everybody to the building itself, and he would have literary lectures or scientific lectures in the great church, night after night, with the feeling that he did something to overcome such a prejudice as I refer to. This seems to me wholly legitimate, and I should think in many instances it would be wise. I should say that there was no line of instruction upon which a church could enter which does not come distinctly within the Christian line of making arrangements that men may have life more abundantly.

I cannot speak of this from experience; we have never had force enough here to do this. But in the largest and best chapel which was ever connected with this church, the building was generally opened every night in the week. I remember that two nights in the week, for one or two winters, a great drawing-school was held in it, the two hundred pupils placing their drawing-boards on the backs of the seats in front of them. From that school, as it happened, the great evening high-school of the city of Boston was born, in which are educated two or three

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousand pupils. I think that was good, legitimate church work, and I am quite sure that such a use of the building itself interested in the church the young people who were there engaged.

IV. But this is simply external, and it might very well be that no such enterprise as this was desirable. Your question goes much deeper, and you do not mean simply to ask what is the physical use to which church property is to be devoted. Is it not clear to anybody who understands city life that a church body of wide-awake people, though there were not more of them than there were of the twelve apostles, can meet as no other body can the very worst difficulties of city life? Take the deadly loneliness of life in cities. If it were understood, as a matter of course, that the parlors of a church were always open, every evening, to anybody who wanted to have some companionship, in the hours between six o'clock and midnight, would not that understanding alone relieve very largely this loneliness? I should like to see a church which had "a light in the window" such as such an arrangement would offer. I do not mean that there should be a committee of people waiting to be "sociable" with anybody that happened along. But I mean that all the neighborhood should understand that there were warmth, light, and a welcome. You might have a class in political economy going on; you might have a class in botany; you might have a class on the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians; you might have a sewing society providing for the Micronesian Islands; you might be occupying yourself in your lighted parlor as you please; but there the light and the company should be. There should be outside a sign offering welcome, and anybody who chose, though he were the veriest waif or stray just landed on the pier, might come in there.

V. I should say that such a haven of rest as this would, in the first place, solve a good many of the difficulties of city life much more simply than they are solved, even by the best arrangements of municipal police. But this is of comparatively little importance. What I should do it for, if I had force enough, would be to give the people who know anything about that church the feeling that the church is home. Nobody can travel so far as to be outside of its arms. It represents welcome, companionship, and sympathy. It represents "Together." That is what it is for.

Suppose that a boy or a girl had grown up in a church which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was thus always open to strangers,—not simply open that they might come in and say their prayers alone, but open that they might warm their feet, and read the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, or the *Century*, or the *Journal of Missions*, and that they might talk with other people like themselves. Suppose such a boy or girl turned up in a strange city,—missed a railroad connection, if you please,—and had to spend the evening there. I think the boy or girl would be apt to walk along the street, looking for the sign of the one door which is never shut, of the one place where there is always a welcome. And I think that the fact that the church offered such a welcome to people on week-days would make the service of the church much more natural and homelike when the bells rang on Sunday.

I have, in other places, at much greater length, attempted to carry out the details of such work of welcome as this, and to such essays of mine I must refer anybody who is interested. What follows is addressed simply to the lay boards of management who direct our large churches. I wish they could be made to understand how much more useful these churches would be if the suggestion made in the next paragraph were attended to.

VI. I know of no church, Protestant or Catholic, in any large American city, which has nearly force enough, in its regular ministry, for the work which it might easily do with the "plant" which it has in its share of real property. The church of which I am the minister could employ to advantage ten or twenty clergymen, where in fact it employs two. As for worship, every church might be open from sunrise on Sunday till late in the evening. As for charity and hospitality, its vestries, parlors, and other offices might be open from the first day of January till midnight on the 31st of December. Whenever a congregation likes to try such an experiment as this, I think that the congregation will be strong in its pecuniary force, and it will gather in a sympathetic body of Christians, who mean to save the world by the Christian religion, and that it will answer your question how our churches can be made more useful.

EDWARD E. HALE.

THOSE who believe that human nature is perfectible, and that human society is progressive, can entertain no doubt that our churches may be made more useful. This verdict of a rational optim-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism is confirmed by experience. Our churches have been improved in every respect. They are more useful to-day thanever before.

The first business of the church is to impress upon the minds of men the great facts of the spiritual realm. Its usefulness depends upon the success with which it fulfills this function. The church has a firmer grasp upon these great facts now than formerly and is able to set them forth more convincingly. The old notion was that the spiritual order was something wholly distinct from, and almost antithetical to, the moral and social order of this world; the new conception is that the spiritual order is realized in the moral and social order of the world, so that the great facts of reward and retribution are not merely facts of revelation, but facts of experience and observation. The new theology, therefore, as Dr. Munger has said, appeals to life continually; it finds in the experience of men and in the facts of history the sure witnesses to the truth of its message. The evidence on which it chiefly rests is evidence that no man can gainsay. Therefore it can speak with stronger emphasis, and can compel the attention of men to these great interests of life.

As an interpreter of life, the church is seen to wield an increasing influence. And its work must, in the nature of things, be more and more practical. The change in its conception of the spiritual order brings it into closer contact with the affairs of every-day life. It begins to see, as it never saw before, that Christianity is not exclusively a scheme for the transportation of a portion of the human race away from this world to a more congenial home beyond the skies, but a plan for the reorganization of life upon this planet; a plan that includes every department of human action—business, politics, society, art, education, amusement,—all the interests of life. As Dr. Henry Hopkins said so strongly in his recent sermon before the American Board of Missions, the great business of the church is to work for the embodiment of Christianity in the life of society. It is evident that in this conception, which is certainly gaining a firm hold of the thought of the leaders of the church to-day, the emphasis is shifted; the life that now is receives far more attention, as compared with the life that is to come, than was formerly the case. That the churches will be more useful as this conception gains clearness and strength cannot be doubted.

In its administration, as well as in its teaching, the church has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been increasing in usefulness, and there is every reason to expect that this improvement will continue. The methods of church work are far more effective now than they were in the boyhood of many of us. The Sunday-school is steadily gaining in efficiency; it has passed through the sophomoric period and is getting down to business; the young people are interested in the work of the church to an extent that was not dreamed of forty years ago; the social life of the church is cultivated with increasing success; and the missionary enterprises at our own doors and in distant places are pushed with growing enthusiasm. That this development of the active life of the church is to go forward is as certain as any future event can be.

If, now, it be asked in what particular directions the life and work of the church are likely to improve, these might be mentioned:

I. The preaching will improve. It will become less dogmatic and more spiritual. It will appeal, more and more, to man's own consciousness of need, and to those ineradicable instincts which testify of things unseen and eternal. The need of forgiveness, the need of guidance, the need of comfort and help—these are the perennial needs of human nature, and the pulpit will learn to bring man's need and God's free grace into closer relation. Doubtless, also, it will comprehend more and more clearly the truth that the kingdom of God is a social as well as a spiritual kingdom, and will give increased attention to the application of the Christian law to social questions.

II. The church will increase its usefulness by applying the law of Christ more vigorously to its own life. Especially necessary is this reformation in the management of the places of public worship. The church of God ought not to be a place where money can buy privilege. The distribution of the sittings in the churches upon competitive principles—the best seat going to the highest bidder—is an anomaly that needs correction. We revolt at simony in the pulpit, but we practise it all the while in the pews. The desire of families to have a definite place assigned to them is natural, but this assignment should be made on some principle that will give the man who pays ten dollars a year an equal chance with the man who pays a thousand dollars a year. If the thousand-dollar man will not contribute unless he can have his first choice, then let him hear the explicit words of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great apostle: "Thy silver perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right before God."

III. The usefulness of the churches would be greatly increased if they would frequently consult together respecting the work to be done in the field which they occupy in common, and would agree upon some simple principle of coöperation. They need not aim at organic unity, but they can certainly agree to keep out of one another's way, to consider one another's interests, and to behave like Christians in their relations with one another. Their usefulness is often sadly impaired by their unseemly and destructive rivalries. Not only the interior life of the churches needs to be more perfectly christianized, but their relations with one another would be greatly improved if they would remember, now and then, in the prosecution of their sectarian schemes, whose kingdom they are building and what is the law of the kingdom.

IV. The churches will be more useful in the time to come, if they will rely less upon missionary methods and more upon the method of colonization. I refer now, of course, to the work in the cities and the large towns of our own country, where the problem of evangelization is most urgent and most difficult. The plan of sending out a few workers from the parent church to gather a mission in one of the destitute districts, or of employing city missionaries and Bible-readers to do the work in these precincts, has, no doubt, accomplished some good, but it is wholly inadequate to the work in hand. The labor of these single-handed missionaries makes little impression upon the mass; nor is it a "mission" that these people need. The church must send forth strong colonies of its best families to plant churches in these dark places. The problem of city evangelization cannot be solved by "mission" churches or Sunday-schools. We may send missionaries to China and Zulu-land, because we cannot go ourselves; but to our neighbors in the down-town wards we can go ourselves; hired emissaries will not answer the purpose, because they cannot possibly convey the one essential gift for which these churchless multitudes are suffering—and that is our love. We must carry that ourselves. A few self-denying workers who go down to the neglected district once a week to sustain by their labors the Sunday-school or the Gospel-meeting can accomplish more, of course, than the single-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handed city missionary; but their interest is only temporary; their membership is elsewhere; they cannot do that permanent, institutional work which the neighborhood needs. That can only be done by a church of strong, intelligent, enthusiastic Christian disciples, planted in the midst of this district, studying its social conditions patiently and, working its leaven into the lump by daily contact and association. Not missions, but colonies, will be the watchword of the church militant in the next generation.

V. I will name only one other way in which it seems to me that many of our churches might be made more useful, and that is by the employment of additional pastoral labor. It is true that the work of the church ought to be done by the members of the church; the great labor of evangelization must be performed by them, and cannot be delegated to others without infinite loss to them; but there is in every large church a great deal of pastoral labor—small details of superintendence and administration—that nobody can perform except the pastor and that he, with the burdens on his hands, is compelled to neglect. The more complex the organization of the church becomes, the more interests there are to be watched and guarded; and the man who tries to be a teacher finds it impossible to attend to them all. A little additional outlay for assistance would greatly increase his efficiency.

WASHINGTON GLADDEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE CLAIM OF "REALISM."

ONE of the most curious phases of our modern literature is the claim put forth in behalf of a so-called "school" of fiction, that theirs is the only literary art worthy the name, because they alone depict "real" life. For this reason they have arrogantly dubbed themselves "realists," while all those whose methods they disapprove are denounced as "idealists." The distinction which is attempted thus to be drawn is a purely fanciful one. The real difference lies deeper. The realist regards art as a means for producing uncomfortable, unpleasant impressions. He paints weakness, indecision, and pettiness; traces the growth of an unworthy sentiment or the aimless *ennui* of a purposeless existence, and says this alone is real life. He depicts suffering and cowardice, duplicity and despair, but omits hope, aspiration, and triumph. He says that the heroic is exceptional, abnormal, and, therefore, unreal; but weakness, self-distrust, and self-consciousness—these are universal, normal, real.

Heretofore, it has been deemed the highest art to contrast in fiction the good and bad, like light and shade in painting. Heroism has been a favorite theme, not only because it is a grand ideal, but because the world needs the stimulus of grand example. The good and the true have been depicted, not only because they are to be found in life, but because they are the best things to be found there, and it is desirable that one should contemplate, not merely a picture of the average life, as the average eye sees it, but also should apprehend the best life and the noblest, in contrast with the weakest, if not the worst.

Our literary "realism," so-called, has set up a false standard of the truth. Only the average, every-day, common-place happenings, it says, are true. They alone are "real," healthful, fit material for fictitious art. If the exceptional is used, it must be rendered gross, common, or repulsive. Who shall strike the average? Who shall say what is every-day life? Who shall separate the exceptional from the common-place?

But even if this might be done, the distinction is still a false one. The exceptional is just as much a part of truth as the common-place. But are heroism and truth and love exceptional? Is he that paints the portrait of beauty without emphasizing her imperfections any more an "idealist" than he who emphazizes her defects without depicting her beauty?

On the other hand, the "realist" strives to maintain his exclusive right to the claim that he is the only truth-teller in fiction by drawing a line betwixt himself and the so-called "naturalist." The real distinction may be stated in a sentence. The "realist" keeps to what he deems a middle course. He paints neither the highest good nor the worst evil. He keeps the middle of the street and never sees what is in the gutter. This, he says, is true—this is real life and everything else is false. The naturalist, on the other hand, believes in high lights and deep shadows. He is sometimes in the palace and anon in the gutter. Truth, he says, does not lie midway between extremes, but embraces the antipodes. The absence of vice or virtue is not life, but the union and contrast of them. So what the "realist" so carefully avoids, the "naturalist" paints with unflagging zeal. Nothing is too high or too low, too fair or too foul, for him. He paints vice in the nude and virtue in its loveliest colors. M. Zola is the type of the "naturalist"; Mr. Howells the head of the "realists."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Curiously enough, while our social and political, and, in a sense, our artistic ideals have been growing towards English in character, our criticism and our literary art have, in a certain diluted form, come to be French in their tendency. Based on the idea that life is essentially mean and petty, they proceed to accomplish their purpose of rendering it "interesting," not by an appeal to sympathy or emotion, nor by carefully wrought out dramatic action, but rather by a wonderfully intricate formulation of moral eccentricities. Each character is made a tangled mass of contradictions, while the climax is a combination of unpleasant incertitudes. That it is art, there can be no question—art of the same elaborate and painful character as a Chinese puzzle; art of the sort that should make angels weep, not because it inclines men to do evil, but because it does an infinitely worse thing in inclining them to do nothing.

As between our "realism"—so-called—and the naturalism of M. Zola, there is a curious kinship. Zola paints foulness in terribly truthful colors. The basest nature grows sick at his disgusting depictions. He scourges high and low with a putrescent lash; but he always scourges. He makes vice mean, unmanly, base, as it must be, and he does not forget that virtue is essentially noble, manly, true. He does not forget, either, that the lowest life may have elements of nobility appealing to the tenderest sympathy. This is his idea of truth, of nature—to paint the devil as foul as he is, in order that his very repulsiveness may strengthen the brave, true nature in manly purpose. His naturalism is so strong that it shocks, terrifies, and, sometimes perhaps, debases and overwhelms. It infects with a sense of foulness from which there is no escape. To the strong it brings a sense of disgusted pity; to the weak, perhaps, even its repulsiveness opens a door to temptation. But while it sometimes smutches the pure, it never omits the element of hope. Evil itself is in his view the incontrovertible proof of a possibility for good. Amid all his blackness, he is singularly careful not to forget that there is, or ought to be, light. If he depicts degradation so terrible as to make his reader cower and tremble with disgust and shame, he is sure to leave the impression that it is not incurable; that vice exists because harmful forces have usurped healthful lives, and that the responsibility for social evils does not rest altogether with their victims.

"Realism," on the other hand, never shocks with its pictures of evil and never charms with unexpected glimpses of virtue. Aspiration it esteems a thing ridiculous, and self-sacrifice an attribute to be ashamed of. Naturalism is a too terrible picture of too prevalent evils; "realism," a hopeless assertion of the universal absence of good. According to its philosophy, vice is, at the worst, only a little more positive form of the doubt and vacillation which constitute its flaccid ideal of virtue. The claim that it is a true picture of life is not a whit more defensible than that of the naturalist. Each paints life from the point of view he has himself selected, no doubt, with painstaking accuracy of detail. The claim of "realism," that the one is true and the other false, is absurd. No one can doubt the work of the naturalist,—as well question the revelations of the anatomist's knife. So far as it goes, it tells all there is to be told, while its assumptive rival does not dare speak the truth of any life, but follows a median line, where it guesses that the average of truth, good and bad, ought to be, and says this is truth; or, if driven from this, falls back on the "interesting" quality, and says that nothing else is artistic. Dark shadows and strong lights are not "interesting," but only mild half-tones, which it asserts are the only real truths it is permissible to use.

Upon the same principle, the "realist" declares that great events and notable acts of individuals, whether real or imaginary, are not fit materials for fiction, because not "interesting." In short, it teaches that the only "interesting" things, which are also allowable artistic material, are the every-day and insignificant happenings of uneventful life. So far as the claim of truth-telling is concerned, the argument lies rather with the "naturalist" than with the "realist." The simple fact is, however, that no novelist paints the real facts of any life. The obligation that rests upon him is to give a true picture of the life he professes to portray, and what he deems the truth depends on what he sees when he studies that life. To one, the inward struggles, aspirations, conflicts of a character—what he does as well as what he hopes to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do—may seem to be the real story; while another may regard his speculations about others, his doubts and worries over trifles, such as the fit of his trousers or the color of his necktie, to be the important realities of his career. On every novelist rests alike the same obligation of truth-telling. "Realist," "naturalist," "idealist," "romancist," only that, and nothing more, can be demanded of them—that they paint life as they see it, feel it, believe it to be. The only quarrel with the "realist" is that he assumes to limit and prescribe the domain of truth for the sake of magnifying his own artistic merit. The genuine article, he would have us believe, is only found in his own little garden. All that grows outside its narrow limits is taboo, and whoever dares to call it art is in danger of being cast into the fire of his own private and self-administered place of "realistic" punishment. Whatever is not fashioned on his own prescribed models is wholly and inconceivably bad. The past and the present are only meritorious as they approximate his standards.

This arrogant assumption has had the effect which successful arrogance always has upon modest aspiration. The American novelist has always been mortally afraid of international criticism, and, instead of being encouraged to follow the lead of his own inclination, he began at once to try to borrow an approved pattern for his work. These great underlying impulses, which really give character to the American people, and ought, therefore, to have given the keynote to our contemporary fiction—these he cast aside and began to study the trepidations, doubts, uncertainties, embarrassments and gaucheries of the afternoon call or the evening "full dress rehearsal," and to call this not only life, but the only and exclusive life that fiction is permitted to depict.

As a result of these things, acting in concert with other causes, we find that nearly thirty years after the eclipse of war, our imaginative literature shows little evidence of the strength, variety, nobility, and grandeur that characterized the epoch preceding the outbreak of rebellion. Its poetry is insignificant; its fiction cramped and petty; its criticism carping rather than appreciative; its spirit dubitant rather than hopeful, and its aim, excellence in the application of imported methods, rather than self-reliant attempts to create a literature not only national, but of that supreme excellence which the conditions of our life would seem to justify the world in expecting at our hands.

ALBION W. TOURGEE.

II.

DECADENCE OF SONG.

IT is generally conceded that many passages of Wagner's operas are almost unsingable. The sequence of tones is not only strained and unnatural for the ear, but equally so for the voice. The result of this is an extraordinary wear on the powers; and when to this harsh progression of tones is added the difficulty of producing the voice under the limitations of the German tongue, the obstacles in the path of the singer become formidable. The Italian language is peculiarly adapted to the art of singing. In the development of this "soft bastard Latin," every hard sound was dropped and the language purified in its vocalism to a degree of unequalled smoothness. It is the preëminently liquid tongue, and its vowel sounds are the elementary tones of human speech. On the other hand, German has a number of mixed tones, such as those represented by the diphthongs au and ei, and the modified vowels ü and ö, which are extremely difficult to sing, except on notes easily produced. The best German singers mar their work by the bad production of notes accompanied by these vowel sounds, while singers of fairly good ability frequently shock the ears of cultured hearers.

Since this is the case in average music, it must obviously be worse in the Wagner music-dramas, because the great German did not give sufficient consideration to the powers of the human voice. The absence, for long spaces, in his scores, of any-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing resembling fluent melody is destructive of proper voice-production. In the famous singing-schools of Italy, in the elder days of vocal art, what the French call *la mise de voix*, or, as we roughly term it, delivery, was a study of years. Delivery consists, according to a respectable authority, "in adapting as perfectly as possible the motions of respiration to the emission of sound, so as to bring out the power of the latter, as much as the quality of the organ and the conformation of the chest will admit, without carrying it to that degree of effort which makes the sound degenerate into a cry." No singer needs to be told that these results cannot be accomplished in the singing of music constructed with little or no attention to the capabilities of the vocal organs. Wagner's carelessness in this matter has forced singers so to sin against the laws of good voice-production that only persons of unusual robustness like Materna, Lehmann, or Scaria, have been able to endure the strain long. These people, moreover, are singing actors rather than vocalists, and the extreme Wagnerites hold that in the future the singing actor must be the artist of the operatic stage. But if we had a school of composition in which the music, faithfully illustrating the truly dramatic book, should be couched in terms of fluent melody and constructed with a view to good vocal results, the kind of artist needed for the operatic stage would not be a singing actor, but an acting singer.

The world is not prepared to give up the art of finished singing. Since the days of Claudio Monteverde, the opera has been the conservatory in which blossomed the rarest flowers of song. Once let the stage lose its culture, and perfect vocalization must disappear. The concert singer and the amateur are not influential enough to counterbalance the authority of the opera. The art of *bel canto* will be lost, and we shall read of the marvellous powers of the singers of by-gone days with scepticism. Farinelli curing Philip V., of Spain, of an attack of melancholy, which threatened his reason; Raff bringing the salvation of tears to the grief-stunned Princess Belmont; Senesino forgetting his part and falling upon the neck of Farinelli after an aria; Crescentini melting Napoleon and his whole court to tears—all these things will become the incredible legends of a musical age of fable; and we shall be compelled to endure at all times, as we are now frequently, bad voice-production, harsh and unmusical declamation, and strident cries, for the sake of a particularly good facial expression and a fine dignity of movement.

W. J. HENDERSON.

III.

NAMING THE NEW STATES.

SINCE the beginning of the pending discussion regarding the advisability of admitting a number of new States into the Union, a vigorous effort has been made to arouse a public sentiment hostile to the retention of the names by which several of the eligible commonwealths have been known since their organization as Territories. Mr. David Dudley Field has been foremost in this crusade against the old names, and he has apparently succeeded in convincing a portion of the press and people of the United States that it would not be advisable to have in the Union States bearing such names as North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and New Mexico. Unfortunately for his cause, however, he has not convinced the people who are most interested, the inhabitants of the territories concerned, that a change of names would be desirable; and Dakotans, Washingtonians, and New Mexicans insist with practical unanimity that the old names of their respective commonwealths be retained.

The objections to the old names, except in the case of Washington, are purely sentimental. It is urged that the names of North Dakota, South Dakota, and New Mexico do not sound well, and that new designations should accordingly be bestowed upon those commonwealths. The additional objection that it would be productive of confusion is urged against the name of Washington. The State of Washington and the city of Washington, say the advocates of a new nomenclature, would constantly be confounded one with the other, and it is, therefore, highly desirable that Washington Territory be admitted into the Union under some other name than that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which it bears. This is the only reason urged for a change of names, which is based upon utilitarian grounds, and it is not by any means a valid one. The fact that New York city and the State of New York bear the same name has never caused a great amount of confusion. Nobody has called for a change of name, either of the city or of the State, because of inability to distinguish between them. How much less would be the liability of confusing a city and a State separated by the width of the continent? A moment's thought will convince one how very improbable such a confusion of the State with the city would be. Indeed, the phrases of common conversation are such as to preclude the possibility of confounding Washington, the city, and Washington, the State. Confusion in the postal service because of the identity of names is equally out of the question. He would be a stupid postal clerk, indeed, who would fail to distinguish between such an address as,

James Alexander,
Washington,
D. C.

and such a one as

James Alexander,
Seattle.
Wash.

The abbreviations which are in common use, and which are authorized by the Post-Office Department, render confusion between the names of States now in the Union much more likely than would be possible between commonwealths designated by such dissimilar abbreviations as "Wash." and "D. C."

This argument, that of possible confusion, is the only one urged in favor of a change of name which is practical in its nature. The others, as has been said, are purely sentimental. North Dakota and South Dakota are objected to because of the prefixes, though nobody thinks of changing the name of North Carolina or South Carolina. New Mexico is also obnoxious because of the prefix, though the name is undeniably more appropriate and, for that matter, more euphonious, than that of New York, New Jersey, or New Hampshire. Indeed, all objections to the names of North Dakota, South Dakota, and New Mexico seem to be based upon an aversion to prefixes. The sentimental arguments against the name of Washington, however, are more numerous and more varied. It is urged that it is contrary to our custom to preserve the names of individuals in the names of the States of the Union. This would not be a convincing argument for changing the name of Washington, even if the assertion upon which it is based were true. As a matter of fact, however, the name of William Penn is preserved in that of Pennsylvania, the name of Charles I. in those of North Carolina and South Carolina, the name of George I. in that of Georgia, and the name of Louis XIV. in that of Louisiana. Nobody is agitating in favor of changing the names of these old commonwealths. Is it to be inferred, therefore, that this objection to the preservation of personal names does not apply to the names of French and English kings, but only to that of the American who would not be a king? Another reason urged for changing the name of Washington is that it was the wish of the forefathers to preserve the name of the Father of his Country in that of the capital city alone, and that it would be contrary to that wish for us to bestow it upon a State as well. This argument would be worthy of consideration, if it were based upon the truth, but as a matter of fact, Thomas Jefferson, as early as 1784, urged that the name of Washington be conferred upon a state of the Union.* Surely this is sufficient warrant for the belief that those who were contemporary with Washington wished to honor his name. The only remaining argument urged against the name of Washington, and it is urged also against the names of North Dakota, South Dakota, and New Mexico, is that it does not sound as well as another name might. This is really no argument at all. It is based solely upon a question of

* Jefferson's Report for Temporary Government of the Northwest Territory, adopted April 23, 1784.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taste, and the names which grate harshly upon the ears of Mr. Field may sound more sweetly to his fellow-citizens than those which he proposes.

It would seem that the single fact that the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and New Mexico are steadfastly opposed to any change in the names of their commonwealths would be sufficient to overbalance all of the sentimental arguments which have been urged in favor of the changes. The inhabitants of these Territories, taken altogether, number not less than twelve hundred thousand people, and their wishes on this subject have repeatedly been expressed in the most unmistakable manner. These wishes are certainly worthy of consideration. They are based upon reasons both practical and sentimental. The names now held by the Territories are interwoven with their business and social life so completely that they can never be eradicated. Banks, newspapers, manufactories, bear the names of Dakota, Washington, and New Mexico. They are trade-marks possessed of no small commercial value. But this is the least of the reasons for the opposition of the people of the Territories to the proposed change of names. The Territory of New Mexico was organized thirty-nine years ago. Washington was organized thirty-six years ago. Dakota was organized twenty-eight years ago. Children born in the Territories bearing those names have grown to manhood and womanhood, loving the commonwealths of their nativity, honoring and cherishing their names. Is it strange that these men and women should resent any attempt to obliterate the names which they have so long cherished, and to place in their stead names around which cluster no memories, names which stand for no associations? "Why," said a native of Washington Territory, "if the name of Washington was changed, I should feel as if my father's name had been taken from me. I should be like a man without a country." If the native of Massachusetts, of Connecticut, or of New York would understand this feeling, let him imagine the name of his State erased from the map and a word substituted which meant nothing to himself or to anybody else. The pride of the people of the Territories in their history and achievements is every whit as strong as that of the people of the older commonwealths, and it is not strange that they protest against the substitution of new names for the ones which their Territories have borne for so many years. Imagine the storm of indignation that would be called forth by a proposition to change the name of the State of Webster, of Clay, or of Lincoln.

The States of the Union should assuredly bear appropriate and pleasing names; but the time to bestow them is when the Territories are organized, not when the States are admitted and after names previously given have become endeared to the people.

FREDERIC JAMES GRANT.

IV.

IMPOSSIBLE PRESIDENTS.

IT is apparent—to any one accustomed to inductive reasoning and capable of generalization—that no one will hereafter be elected President who has not been elected by the time he is sixty.

It is now a hundred years since Washington, at the age of fifty-seven was chosen. Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and J. Q. Adams were each elected at that same age.

Of the twenty-three Presidents, only three were elected after the age of sixty-one. Of these three, two were military men who died soon after inauguration, and the other was James Buchanan.

Eighteen of the twenty-three were elected before the age of 60, one at 50, and seven while in the forties. General Grant was 46; Mr. Cleveland, 47; and General Harrison, 55.

Unwritten law which has been solidified by time and approved by experience is most difficult of repeal! it is founded on reason. Many an aspiring statesman will beat, with bruised hands, against this law, but it will stand; and it will be as difficult for one who has passed sixty to reach the Presidency "as for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of Heaven."

S. J. WILKES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

I.

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

DR. WILLIAM SHEDD'S treatise, or rather text-book, issued by the Scribners,* gives a clear and logical presentation of doctrinal theology of the general type of what is usually understood as Calvinistic, or, as the author terms it, Augustino-Calvinistic. Dr. Shedd is an eminent teacher of these doctrines, and is undoubtedly a high authority on all patristic questions, and in his treatment of the different topics which group themselves around this general heading, he does not hesitate to avow his decided preference for the reasonings of the ancient fathers of the Church, expounded by the systems of Calvin and other writers of the Reformation period, over the advanced and progressive theology of the present age, on the ground, as he puts it, that the works of such men as Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm, and Calvin are based on scriptural revelation and were designed by Providence to stand as bulwarks of the faith for all time. As an exposition of the views usually held by the Calvinistic school, this work is entitled to the highest respect. Dr. Shedd uses the liberty of an expositor to give his own interpretation and philosophic explanation of certain points, as, for example, the doctrine of original sin; but in the main the work is strictly within the lines of the orthodox evangelical school. There is abundant evidence of research and sound scholarship, and the treatment of the various topics is elaborate, comprehensive, and profound, without prolixity or pedantry. The two volumes comprise seven main treatises, of which the first is introductory and deals with the divisions and definitions of what the author calls "theological science." The other divisions are Bibliology, Theology in its strict sense, as referring to the nature and attributes of the Divine Being, Anthropology or the science of man in his relation to God, Christology or the person of Christ, Soteriology or the atonement and its application to individuals, and Eschatology or the doctrine of the Intermediate State and of Final Things. It is impossible to attempt a review of these collected treatises in the space at our disposal. The subjects are chiefly of interest to scholarly theologians. Dr. Shedd does not conceal his contempt for the criticisms of men who, themselves not theologians, venture to attack the patristic theology. He says: "As the scientific comprehension of law is expected from jurists and not from laymen, so that of theology must be sought among philosophers and divines." There is, however, as we venture to suggest, this difference. The principles of human jurisprudence are based on the innate perceptions of truth and morality prevalent in human society, and where a law violates these principles its doom is certain.

* "Dogmatic Theology." By William G. T. Shedd, D. D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fundamental principles of theology, as theology is here presented to us, are above and beyond human comprehension and can only be measurably *apprehended;* hence doctors and experts in theology assume or appear to speak with something of a supernatural authority. This has always been the claim of ecclesiastics, more or less distinctly avowed, and men have over and over again risen up in rebellion against it, claiming that the human intellect and conscience may and must eventually sit in judgment upon every system of religious faith, and that those systems or parts of systems which do violence to the reason and judgment of mankind must sooner or later go to the wall. Dr. Shedd, in this treatise, labors hard, and with varying success, to expound the abstruse points of the Calvinistic creeds, and to this extent, we presume, recognizes the right of men to accept or reject his propositions, within the limits of conscience and under the guidance of the spirit of truth. As an exhibit of the distinctive doctrines of the evangelical school, the work is of pre-eminent value.

II.

MEMOIRS OF GENERAL SHERIDAN.

AMONG all the military memoirs called forth by the late Civil War, none surpasses in sustained interest, or in simple, graphic style of narration, that of General Sheridan.* At first the reader probably fears that the autobiographical form of the story may prove to be inconvenient. It is so difficult for any one to sit down and write an account of his own exploits without doing injustice either to himself or the history! In this case, the story grows in attractiveness with every page. For severe simplicity and dignity, and the absence of grandiloquence and perfervid enthusiasm, the book reminds one of the pages of Xenophon. Possibly Sheridan himself might have posed as a greater man, and possibly a greater tribute might have been paid to his memory as a successful soldier, if his history had been written by another person; but the world would have lost a book of classic merit, as this book undoubtedly is, and it will be so regarded by future generations. The closing chapters give an account of his experiences and impressions in the German camp as a spectator of the Franco-German contest of 1870.

III.

THE JEWISH RELIGION.

A BRIEF résumé of the history and evolution of the Jewish religion is undertaken by Rabbi Solomon Schindler, of the Temple Adath Israel, Boston, in "Dissolving Views of the History of Judaism."† The three objective points may be stated as follows: Religion has ever been changing; the forms have changed only where their underlying principles have outlived their usefulness; and the present generation has the same right to change its religious practices as had its predecessors. The work is composed of a series of week-day lectures, which were delivered by the rabbi to his congregation in the form of brief biographical studies of prominent Jewish leaders from the earliest times to the present day. These are concise in style and philosophical in tone.

The religion of the early Hebrews is considered from a lower plane than usual, only two biblical characters being introduced, and these are treated with rather

* "Personal Memoirs of P. H. Sheridan," General United States Army. 2 vols. Charles L. Webster & Co.

† "Dissolving Views in the History of Judaism." By Rabbi Solomon Schindler. Boston: Lee & Shepard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scant ceremony. The list of those of the later centuries includes the names of Rabbi Ben Saccai, Saadia, Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn, Sir Moses Montefiore and Rabbi Isaac M. Wise, with many others. Each is considered in connection with contemporaneous events, and a flood of light is thus thrown on the progress of the Jewish religion. The reader turns to the chapter on the Talmud with hopeful anticipations, but his clouded conception of that remarkable work does not become clearer, since the best illustration of its voluminous contents which the author can give is this: "If you could collect, of all the newspapers published in four or five countries during the last four hundred years, at least one copy for every year and paper; if you could take this material—leaders, essays, news, reviews—string them together without title or chronological order, and publish them in book form, you would have a literary production somewhat similar to the Talmud." The Bible, says the rabbi, has long since ceased to be regarded by the Jews as a work of inspiration, and this belief is attributed to the fact that the underlying principles of Judaism have undergone a change. The same, substantially, is said of the Jewish belief in a coming Messiah. Unless this be the work of an extreme radical in the Hebrew fold, we think the average reader will be surprised at, as well as interested in, the unfolding of the doctrines now held by this ancient people. But the author plainly avows, in the closing chapter on "The Present Hour," that it is difficult to formulate the belief of the modern Jew. "Under conditions as they are, it is an absolute impossibility to establish a definition of the term [Judaism] which would suit the many heads and many brains which compose what we call the Jewish community."

IV.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A useful little handbook of social customs, entitled "Hints About Men's Dress,"* by a New York clubman, has just been issued and will serve to answer many questions from the curious and uninitiated in such important matters.

Lee & Shepard issue several valuable reprints and some original works in their Good Company series. Miss Frances Power Cobbe's treatise on "Religious Duty"† presents the moral aspects of Christianity from an intelligent stand-point, and will repay perusal. The range of topics is not exactly limited by the title of the book, since it includes not only religious obligations, but also religious offences, such as blasphemy, apostacy, hypocrisy, perjury, sacrilege, etc., and religious faults, such as thanklessness, irreverence, prayerlessness, impenitence, scepticism, worldliness. The obligations enumerated are thanksgiving, adoration, prayer, repentance, faith, and self-consecration. Miss Cobbe's writings are pervaded by a true and spiritual fervor, and, while they reflect her theological views as a Unitarian, are edifying and helpful to a remarkable degree. Richard Steele's papers on "The Lover,"‡ and other selected topics from *The Englishman* and other periodicals, which delighted our grandfathers and grandmothers, make pleasant reading for this generation, if only to serve the purpose of showing how very much human nature of to-day resembles that of previous generations.

*"Hints about Men's Dress. Right Principles Economically Applied." By a New York Clubman. D. Appleton & Co.

†"Religious Duty." By Frances Power Cobbe. Lee & Shepard.

‡"The Lover," and Selected Papers from *The Englishman*, etc., etc. By Richard Steele. Lee & Shepard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Douglas Jerrold's "Fireside Saints,"* "Mr. Caudle's Breakfast Talks," and other papers are also included in this series, and have a certain classical interest, besides their faculty of making entertainment. The same may be said of Leigh Hunt's "Wishing-Cap Papers,"† to which the publishers append the note "Now First Collected." There is something particularly charming about this writer, and the papers given are just of that variety which whiles away care and tends to restfulness and contentment in the reader. "Dreamthorp, a Book of Essays Written in the Country,"‡ by Alexander Smith, is couched in a thoughtful vein, and appeals to the better instincts of human nature. Among the topics dwelt upon are "On Death and the Fear of Dying," in which are some admirable and helpful reflections, and "On the Importance of a Man to Himself," in which is abundance of wise and practical philosophy worth absorbing into one's mental self. There are also other papers.

Mr. N. R. Waters, in his book, "Rome or Reason,"‖ gives a very frank and lucid autobiography of his experiences through an intellectual and spiritual groping after truth which lasted for many years. These brought him through the dogmas of the Protestant religion, which he discovered to be "founded on sand," to the calm authoritativeness of Roman Catholicism, and onward to a period of doubt, negation, and moral incertitude, followed at last by settled peace and satisfaction in the acceptance of conscience and duty as the great guides for humanity. The tone of the book is reverential towards sacred things, but positive in its discarding of what is understood as theology, "especially the patristic and Calvinistic theology which claims the name of orthodox."

Mr. Hittell gives, in his little manual,§ some exceedingly good advice as to the conduct of life from the stand-point of pure and lofty secularism. And to a great deal here advanced the Christian moralist will not be disposed to take exception, though the author is not in sympathy with Christianity as a faith and system.

Under a title whose suitableness is not at once apparent,** a half-dozen sermons by as many ministers are collected. Each was delivered at some Unitarian convention in this country or in Europe within the past six years, and, naturally enough, each illustrates some leading tenet of the Unitarian faith. His will not attract the attention of a large class of readers, since a peculiarly narrow conception of things spiritual inheres in nearly all portions of the book. The names of the authors are sufficiently well known to indicate a high grade of literary workmanship and considerable eloquence.

*"Fireside Saints," "Mr. Caudle's Breakfast Talk," and other papers. By Douglas Jerrold. Lee & Shepard.

†"The Wishing-Cap Papers." By Leight Hunt. Lee & Shepard.

‡"Dreamthorp. A Book of Essays Written in the Country." By Alexander Smith. Lee & Shepard.

‖"Rome or Reason: A Memoir of Christian and extra-Christian Experience." By Nathaniel Ramsay Waters. New York: Charles P. Somerby.

§"A Code of Morals." By John S. Hittell. San Francisco: The Bancroft Company.

**"Show Us the Father." By M. J. Savage, S. R. Calthrop, H. M. Simmons, J. W. Chadwick, W. C. Gannett, J. L. Jones. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS RECEIVED.

G. P. Putnam's Sons.
The Economic Interpretations of History. Lectures delivered in Worcester Coll. Hall, Oxford, 1887–88. James E. Thorold Rogers.
The Tariff History of the United States. A series of essays. F. W. Taussig, LL.B., Ph.D.
American Literature. 1607–1885. Charles F. Richardson. In 2 vols. Second volume: American Poetry and Fiction.
The Story of Holland. James E. Thorold Rogers.
Industrial Liberty. John M. Bonham.

L. K. Strousse & Co., New York.
The Civil-Service Law. A defence of its principles, etc. Wm. Harrison Clarke.

D. Lothrop Company.
Babyland. Edited by the Editors of Wide-Awake.
Pansies for Thoughts. From the writings of Mrs. G. R. Alden.

Fords, Howard & Hulbert.
The Human Mystery in Hamlet; an attempt to say an unsaid word. Martin W. Cooke.

Belford, Clarke & Co.
Divided Lives. A novel Edgar Fawcett.

A. H. Smythe, Columbus, O.
A History of Ohio. Daniel J. Ryan.

The Bancroft Co., San Francisco.
A Code of Morals. John S. Hittell.

Exchange Printing Co., New York.
Letters from Waldegrave Cottage. The Rev. Geo. W. Nichols, A.M.

The Burrows Brothers' Company, Cleveland, O.
The Pocket Gem Pronouncing Dictionary.

Charles T. Dillingham.
The Battle of the Swash and the Capture of Canada. Samuel Barton.
When Age Grows Young. A Romance. Hyland C. Kirk.

D. W. Lerch, Bradford, Pa.
Labor, Capital and Money; Their Just Relations. C. C. Camp.

E. Glaeser.
The Social Question in the Light of History and the Word of Truth. The Rev. John H. Oerter.

Cranston & Stowe.
Letters to a King. Albion W. Tourgee, LL.D.

Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati.
The Practical Works of Gay Waters, including the Wicota.

Argosy Press, Georgetown, British Guiana.
The Cavaliers and Roundheads of Barbadoes, 1650–1652. N. Darnell Davis.

Benziger Brothers, Cincinnati.
God, Knowable and Known. Maurice Ronayne, S. J.

Ginn & Company.
Sharing the Profits. Mary Whiton Calkins, A. M.

Nixon-Jones Printing Company, St. Louis.
Essays on God and Man; or, a Philosophical Inquiry into the Principles of Religion. The Rev. Henry Truro Bray, LL. D.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED